

GEORGE WILLIAMS
COLLEGE
LIBRARY



Gift of
Estate of
Mrs. Mary Fowler

Mary Fowler

To

Mrs. Fred Miller,
with

the Compliments of the
writer,

Chas. Kuhlman

PACIFISM AS THE
UNIFYING THESIS OF
ALL SOCIAL REFORM

A CRITICISM

BY
CHARLES KUHLMAN



BOSTON
RICHARD G. BADGER
THE GORHAM PRESS

THE MASTER'S COLLEGE
POWELL LIBRARY
SANTA CLARITA, CA 91321

K 955 p

COPYRIGHT, 1922, BY CHARLES KUHLMAN

All Rights Reserved

Made in the United States of America

The Gorham Press, Boston, U. S. A.



PREFACE AND INTRODUCTION

The seven essays in this collection were not written in the order in which they appear in the present volume. I, IV, and III were published in the *Mid-West Quarterly* in July, 1915, 1916 and 1917 respectively and are here reproduced without change. VI and VII were written from January to March, 1919, with some changes made later, while II and V have only just been completed, that is to say, were written from January to April, 1921.

Each essay, therefore, bears internal evidence of its approximate date of origin and the whole work covers a period of six years—long enough for the writer to round out his views and in some particulars change them. In these six years—1915 to 1921—pacifism has developed rapidly and has now fully disclosed its sinister character as a revolutionary propaganda for the overthrow of existing society. These wider aims of pacifism were not so apparent when the first essay, *Pacifism as an Offspring of the French Revolution* was written in January, 1915. The germ for the future growth, the tendency for the movement to identify itself with the radicalism generally was indeed there, but no one could at

that time foresee that a scholarly president of the United States would adopt not only the leading dogmas but even the very spirit of an unscientific and dishonest propaganda and succeed in carrying with him a large section of the intellectuals and the bulk of the political liberals among his countrymen. This is an event so extraordinary that the future historian will long be puzzled to fully account for it. To me this appears as one of the most inglorious chapters in our history, happily offset, however, by the fine record of our army in France and by the conduct of a few courageous senators who, in spite of all threats and denunciations, held their ground—America's ground—until we recovered our normal common sense. But the world is today paying a fearful price for our temporary lapse.

The peace ideal of the original pacifist movement is now lost and with it the spirit of peace and sane debate. It is still a question whether pacifism has swallowed liberalism or liberalism pacifism, or whether socialism has swallowed both. The exact relation between these three elements will, no doubt, become clearer in time. Perhaps the old political liberal will recover from his suicidal folly and come home. At present he is in the camp of his worst enemies. Pacifism is the "unifying thesis" which has led him to fight in the cause of those who seek in the name of democracy, liberty and justice, to establish the tyranny of government over the in-

dividual in order to plunder and destroy. No revolution has ever contained as much incendiary material as the one now threatened, and in every revolution that is vigorously opposed, as this one will be, the most radical and ruthless element in the end prevails. In this case the aim of the radical is the destruction of the capitalistic system, which is to say, civilization. The capitalistic system, in its present colossal development, is the characteristic work of the individualistic political liberal. When things have reached the point where he is no longer needed, he will receive short shift at the hands of those who are now using him for their own purposes. His main defense has always been the intellect, reason, or what passed for reason. This defense he has himself now broken down, for his language today is hardly distinguishable from that which has been on the lips of the social revolutionists for decades. I see no reason why he should expect to escape the fate of his class who followed his course in France in 1789 and in Russia during the twenty years or more preceding the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917.¹ So far as essential ideas are concerned the situation is the same the world over.

The capitalistic system is inconceivable apart from private property and private property itself is

¹Yesterday (April 4, 1921) there was published in the newspapers an account of a letter written by Maxim Gorky to a friend in Sweden appealing to the world to come to the aid of

impossible except in a competitive society. It rests upon conflict latent or actual and is sanctioned as dynamically good by our evolutionary social sciences.

the Russian intellectuals, who he said, were being exterminated, and that without them Russia could never recover. And yet Maxim Gorky is now living under the very régime he has himself urged upon Russia. In his *Comrades*, written twenty years ago, I find this: "The world is for the workers! For us there is no nation, no race. For us there are only comrades and foes. All the working men are our comrades; all the rich, all the authorities are our foes. When you see how numerous we working men are, how tremendous the power of the spirit in us, then your heart is seized with such joy, such happiness, such a great holiday sings in your bosom! And, mother, the Frenchman and the German feel the same way when they look upon life, and the Italian also. We are the children of one mother—the great, invincible idea of the brotherhood of the workers of all countries over all the earth. This idea grows, it warms us like the sun; it is the second sun in the heaven of justice, and this heaven resides in the working man's heart. Whoever he be, whatever his name, a socialist is our brother in spirit now and always, and through all the ages for ever and ever!"

Evidently M. Gorky has changed his mind about the "heaven and justice" in the "working man's heart."

I believe that a large section of the Russian intellectuals at that time preached this doctrine of the proletarian dictatorship. At the very time Gorky was writing *Comrades* I was a student at the University of Paris where I met a group of Russian students, revolutionaries. With one of these men I became rather well acquainted and we had many interesting conversations. His Bible was Marx's *Capital*, which has the proletarian dictatorship in the background. The last time I called upon this man I traced him to a place one does not mention in polite society. Before leaving France he secured a paper from the British ambassador at Paris entitling him to the protection of an English subject. When I parted from him at the *Gare du Nord* he kissed me on the left cheek and carried with him two hundred francs of my money which he forgot to return.

In France many of those who espoused the cause of the workmen or "Fourth Estate" lost their heads on the guillotine during the Terror.

Pacifism, therefore, is a challenge to evolutionary science which represents the various forms of conflict as leading factors in progress. The majority of pacifists realize this vaguely, at least, if not clearly. Hence most of them have little use for science. They insist that conflict is destructive rather than creative. Their original object of attack was war. They opposed the idea of conflict with that of co-operation, substituting "common interests" for "conflicting interests." It is easy to see why socialists and communists are pacifists, for, as said, private property results and can result only from conflicting interests. On the other hand, it is natural for pacifists to drift ever closer to socialism under the delusion that conflicting interests would disappear in a socialistic society. Thus in seeking to enforce what they call social justice those in the liberal-pacific combination are attempting to shackle the individual to prevent conflict. In doing this they are pushing the state continually farther into socialistic ventures and in numberless ways narrowing the conception of private property. Regulation of business has in many instances gone a long way toward actual confiscation, for property in which the nominal owner has lost that element of control upon which profitable use depends has, in effect, ceased to belong to him. Public utilities are rapidly coming under this sort of control by the politicians or men dependent upon them. Such properties are

always more or less at the mercy of the exigencies of political campaigns where truth and honesty have long been heavily discounted. But there is no sharp distinction between public utilities and ordinary private business. Every legitimate business is in a measure a "public utility." Today this regulation is concerned chiefly with transportation, mining and meat packing, while cold storage, timberland, water power, and land generally are on the fringe of the storm. As soon as the farmers have perfected their marketing organization and raised it to the level of efficiency long obtaining in other lines of industry, we may expect a strong demand for government regulation of the whole field of exchange, a regulation which, to be effective, must almost of necessity take the form of price fixing. When we have reached that point the regulation of production follows as a matter of course because the law of supply and demand will then no longer operate naturally. When price fixing becomes universal private enterprise will languish and finally disappear. Voluntary co-operation and even communistic association, so long as they are not favored by monopolistic legislation, may advance indefinitely without danger to private enterprise, but under monopolistic state socialism there is no half-way station. Experience everywhere has shown that "nationalization" is a failure, that it can be maintained only by taxing private business to

cover losses.² The latter may be able to sustain this drain for a time but in the end it will either be taxed out of existence or voluntarily liquidated out of sheer discouragement, thus forcing the state to cover the whole field.

In this way pacifism, the movement to eliminate conflict from human society, merges with the socialist doctrine. The pacifist cannot present his case effectively without overemphasizing co-operation and organization. He is everywhere back of the "nationalization" movement. He is of necessity a believer in extreme social action designed to protect the weak and inefficient against the economically strong, and he does not always stop when the scales of justice balance. He demands discriminatory, even confiscatory, taxation of successful business to relieve the unsuccessful man from a share of his just burden. He is, if the word is allowed, a new "Equalitarian." He has abandoned the idea of equality before the law, a doctrine under which men prosper according to merit, for equality by legislative fiat in the matter of material possessions. The pacifist, to be sure, does not always put the matter in this way. The rich are, in his view, criminal and reactionary autocrats who uphold the force ideal because of the advantages they are said to reap from

² See, for instance, Harold Cox, *Economic Liberty*, Chap. XII, *Nationalization*.

it. Dollar diplomacy, national finance, and pressure for armaments originate in this motive, they say.

So, begin where we may in our study, we find that pacifism is indeed what Dr. Nasmyth calls it, "The unifying thesis of all social reform." That is to say, it is the idea that runs through the whole radical program irrespective of type or name. To change the figure, it is today a sort of catch-basin into which the various forms of discontent are poured, a preparatory antechamber from which the entrance into full socialism is easy and natural. The propaganda seems to be financed and directed from a single centre. It is difficult to escape the conviction that great numbers of newspapers are directly subsidized and furnished with either fully prepared editorials or skeleton editorials and news matter colored in favor of the propaganda. There is a disquieting uniformity in pacifist editorials combined with an inconsistency which seems to suggest forgetfulness on the part of editors when they venture on observations of their own. When we read an editorial implying a certain mental background on the part of the writer and a few days later find another editorial in the same paper entirely inconsistent with this background, and when this occurs again and again, one is certainly justified in suspecting that one or the other editorial originated outside the editor's office, and that the busy editor

has failed to assimilate what was sent him for publication. Nor does this happen only with small country papers edited by men whose editorial work is a severe task for them. I have in mind a large daily published in a great educational centre and catering to a rather select clientele, edited by men whose intellectual attainments qualify them for work on metropolitan dailies, which has again and again betrayed this peculiarity. And though many of its voluntary correspondents have repeatedly taken it to task for what must at best appear as insincerity the process has gone on for years and still continues. I have noticed the same thing in several of our largest agricultural publications which, in the influence they exert, stand in a class by themselves in that their editorials are probably more carefully read and pondered than those of any other class of newspapers because of the comparative isolation of their readers. —

I have in several places used unsparing language in dealing with the works of pacifist writers, flatly charging dishonesty. Such a charge is not to be made lightly, and as a rule one does not recommend his own work by disparaging that of others. But I think that I can say truthfully that the evidence presented justifies such charges. In each case treated I have given sufficiently definite citations to enable the reader to verify what I have said. I considered it part of my duty to warn unwary readers of pac-

ifist literature that they are not always honestly dealt with. Nor am I the first person to make such charges in writing. While Mr. G. G. Coulton was preparing his work, *The Main Illusions of Pacifism*, for the press, he offered Mr. Angell an opportunity to defend himself against accusations of this kind he (Mr. Coulton) had made in previous articles, agreeing to print the defense in the forthcoming volume. Mr. Angell accepted, and in his defense actually misquoted and misrepresented his own work, *The Great Illusion*. His letter of defense is textually printed in Appendix I of *The Main Illusions of Pacifism* with the passages from *The Great Illusion* which were misquoted or misrepresented. I had, before reading Mr. Coulton's work, discovered some of Mr. Angell's tricks (for this lapse from literary rectitude cannot be called by a milder term) and had prepared an article exposing some of them, but I was far from having perceived how systematic and deep was his sinning.

The Great Illusion produced such a profound impression because it dealt with fundamental issues in the field of the social sciences. The writer seemed to have overturned some of the basic generalizations of the evolutionists. A close reading showed that he produced this impression by skilful misrepresentations, misleading adjectives and misplaced emphasis. When the work is stripped of this what

remains is little more than a collection of common-places.

War and the Breed of Dr. David Starr Jordan, and *Social Progress and the Darwinian Theory* of Dr. George Nasmyth, do not sin quite so grossly or systematically as does *The Great Illusion*, but they fall far short of scientific and literary honesty. I have selected them for criticism because they also, like *The Great Illusion*, pretend to refute fundamental generalizations of evolutionary science.

But I do not wish to be understood as implying that all pacifist writers are either dishonest or ignorant. On the contrary there are some excellent pacifist works written by men who are well equipped for their work and who would scorn to mislead. Although I would prefer to see them write as scholars rather than as pacifists, I have no quarrel with them. They seek to inform and as far as they go do inform their readers. Their work is, therefore, necessary and good, for we all want peace if it may be had at a reasonable price even if we feel that war is sometimes still a valuable driving force and that prolonged peace brings evils which seem to be without remedy short of war. There is, I verily believe, no government in existence which would deliberately choose war merely to gain the incidental benefits which militarists claim for it. The real quest must, therefore, be a code of conduct that shall not only avoid war but also those evils which

perpetual peace seems to bring. I have not presumed to pass definite judgment on this point, but have made a few suggestions at the close which appear to me to be in harmony with scientific thought and upon which the opposing parties may find common ground, assuming that they really seek a solution.

CHAS. KUHLMAN.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE AND INTRODUCTION	3
I. PACIFISM AS AN OFFSPRING OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION	17
II. THE SCOPE AND TENDENCY OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT	49
III. DAVID STARR JORDAN—EUGENICS AND WAR	94
IV. THE PRINCE OF PEACE	126
V. THE RATIONAL CAUSES AND FUNCTIONS OF WAR	156
VI. THE TWILIGHT OF THE MIDDLE CLASS	203
VII. ALTRUISM, JUSTICE, AND THE STRUGGLE FOR SURVIVAL	250

**PACIFISM
AS THE UNIFYING THESIS
OF ALL SOCIAL REFORM**

PACIFISM AS THE UNIFYING THESIS OF ALL SOCIAL REFORM

I

PACIFISM AS AN OFFSPRING OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

Modern pacifism is a by-product of social democracy. It originated in the extreme left wing of the French Revolution. Its first representatives are found among those men of terror and blood who made themselves known and abhorred throughout the world as "Jacobins." The revolution was, at its inception, a revolt against the absolute monarchy in France only. It was not until this monarchy had been completely overthrown that it took the form of a declaration against practically all the other governments of Europe. The classic argument of kings, the bayonet, failed Louis XVI when the army stood aloof or made common cause with the revolution and then dissolved into an undisciplined rabble. On the other hand, as the national

guards were being organized in large numbers, the better informed leaders began to feel secure against a return of despotism from within. As long as France did not quarrel with her neighbours her enthusiasts appeared justified in painting her future in the rosiest colours.

But just here was the difficulty. Was it possible for France to remain at peace with her unregenerate neighbours? If not, her disorganized condition exposed her to the peril of subjugation and the destruction of the liberty she had just gained with so much labour and misgiving. Men with some military knowledge understood well enough that the national guards could not, without further discipline and training, be relied on for defence against a foreign enemy. But they found it almost impossible to obtain a hearing. Fear of a military despotism had already established the cult of anti-militarism. The national guards themselves soon fell under suspicion. It was felt that they must not be made too efficient. No *esprit de corps* was to be tolerated among them; their uniform was not to be worn outside the hour of actual service. Lafayette, commandant of the guards of Paris, struggling to introduce some kind of discipline, was denounced as a traitor preparing for a military dictatorship, and everything was done to encourage insubordination. The guardsman was not to be a machine compelled to obey without question. He was to be free to

decide for himself whether or not his orders were legal or "patriotic."

It was evident, then, that the revolution must make friends abroad in order to escape the necessity of maintaining a large and disciplined army at home. The matter became acute in the spring of 1790. England and Spain had become involved in a violent dispute over conflicting claims in the Nootka Sound region. War appeared imminent and Spain expected aid from France in virtue of a "Family Compact" entered into in 1762. When the subject was brought before the National Assembly on May 14th, a cry at once arose that the whole affair rested upon a ministerial intrigue directed from the Court of France through its ambassador at Madrid. The Jacobin Club held an extraordinary session in the evening and all its leaders attacked the ministry, which, they said, desired war with England in order to withdraw attention from the revolution at home. They opposed the government's request for the small credit needed to arm fourteen ships of the line, a precautionary measure deemed wise in view of the spectacular preparations England was making. Having lost this point, they next sought a decree which should lodge the power of declaring war and making peace in the national assembly. But they were outmaneuvered and forced to accept a compromise, leaving the initiative with the king and only the power of sanction or revision

with the assembly. This decree was denounced by the whole Jacobin wing of the revolution as the work of a ministerial clique bent upon war. One concession, however, the defeated party had gained. It had induced the assembly to incorporate in the decree an article containing a solemn proclamation to the world renouncing all desire of conquest and pledging France never to engage in offensive wars.

This was on May 22d. Toward the close of June it became known that the government had received from Spain the anticipated request for aid. The Jacobins, the peace advocates of the day, were now confronted with the necessity either of discussing the merits of the case or of openly repudiating the obligations of France contracted under the old or absolute monarchy. Without hesitation they chose the latter alternative. The Marquis of Girardin laid before the society a general statement which may be accepted as fairly representative of the Jacobin view, since it was printed and distributed in the name of the society.

What should the national assembly say to Spain in reply to her request for aid? asked the Marquis. How was it possible to make any intelligent reply whatever without the exact knowledge the ministry alone possessed? Certainly the assembly could never hope to extract the truth from such a source. It would be folly to attempt to "penetrate the tortuous labyrinth of the politics of courts," for in this field

of intrigue the ministers were past masters. The assembly would only besmirch itself by going into the question of fact at all. Aside from all this there could be no thought of war because of the exhausted condition of the country.

In this day of our destinies, he continued, it is not to Spain alone that France must reply, but to all peoples, and at this moment, above all, to the English people; they have given us a full assurance of peace, they are watching us, they await our reply. Let it be equivocal in ever so slight a degree and the whole ministerial league will immediately seize upon it to make war upon us. If on the contrary our reply bears the grand character of frankness and loyalty, every pretext will be wanting. The English people are convinced that they ought to esteem us, to regard us as compeers in liberty, and to sustain us even against their own ministers who are everywhere alike the enemies of all liberties.

There was, then, only one reply worthy of inspiring universal confidence and consistent with the principles of the revolution, namely, the decree of the national assembly not to wage offensive wars.

It is this decree, so just, so wise, so magnanimous, which must at this moment be, in the name of the French people, solemnly proclaimed and authentically notified to all peoples. This striking act of the national word of honour will alone suffice as the tie of civil confraternity among all men, and at the same time become the sacred ægis of the constitution, of liberty, of peace, and of the glory of France.

The Marquis closed his speech with a piece of sheer bombast, which we quote because it truthfully reflects the Jacobin spirit of the time.

What became, he said, of the innumerable multitude of the slaves of Xerxes before a small number of free men? The whole of Europe is not in condition to attack a free France at her hearthstone, a people of brothers under a paternal royalty and holding out a pacific hand toward all men. If any despots, in defiance of the sacred laws of eternal justice, should dare, like brigands, to come and attack us at home, they will gain nothing, except to see their slaves free themselves and unite themselves to liberty.

The Jacobins were mistaken in regard to the temper of the English people as a whole. They were in possession of some evidence that a portion of the English, the opposition minority, were well disposed toward the French. They had been for some time in correspondence with a "Society of the Revolution" in London which held a position in England similar, in some respects, to that of the Jacobins in France. The London society contained a number of influential men, among them Lord Stanhope. It was anti-ministerial and stood at the head of a national propaganda whose ostensible object was to disseminate the ideas of the English revolution of 1688. Like the Jacobins it had branches of affiliated societies outside the capital. In November, 1789, it had sent a letter of felicitation to the national assembly at Paris which served as evidence of a

desire for fraternization. The intercourse between these French and English societies was of a very cordial nature. When a Jacobin went to London he was received with open arms by the society and the same friendship was shown the Londoner when he visited any of the Jacobin societies whether in Paris or in the provinces. While the Spanish-English dispute was in progress, members of the London society crossed the channel into Brittany, called upon the local societies and were banqueted by them. At Nantes toasts were drunk to "Lord Stanhope," "The Honourable Members of the Society at London," and "The English People." The society at Cherbourg exchanged fraternal letters with their friends in England, in which the idea of war between the two countries was deprecated. The Jacobins at Nantes were not satisfied with having fêted their visitors. They commissioned their president to go to London to present the society there with the flag used at their banquet as "an emblem of fraternity." Later in the year commissioners were sent out from London to visit all the Jacobin societies of France, of which there were now several hundred, and affiliate them.

This friendly intercourse across the English Channel is now an obscure matter. Little or no trace of it is to be found in the histories of the period. But at the time it attracted considerable attention, for references to it are found not only in

a number of prominent journals of Paris but also in those of the provinces.

England and Spain finally adjusted their differences and the war clouds in this quarter of the international horizon dissolved. Lord Acton says that thanks to the pacific attitude of France, Pitt, one of the "enemies of all liberties," scored a diplomatic victory against the ally of her traditional foe. But now the rulers of Europe were becoming uneasy at the news arriving from the great capital on the Seine. The absolute monarchy, overthrown in France, was about to throw down the gauntlet to the revolution which was becoming ever more aggressive. The answer of the revolution was the proclamation of the brotherhood of man and a declaration of war upon man's enemies, his rulers. But it was to be a war without bloodshed. The thesis of the Marquis of Girardin that not even the mercenaries of tyranny would, when enlightened, fight a free people who offered them liberty instead of bullets, was now taken up in earnest. France was deemed entirely safe if only she could make her neighbours understand her fraternal sentiments. As an open propaganda on foreign soil was out of the question, the printing press was naturally the first thing to be thought of. To escape the censor a resourceful person suggested in all seriousness that a corps of balloonists might cross the frontiers and drop the *Rights of Man*, pamphlets, and newspapers

broadcast from the skies, a free gift directly to the people. A Prussian observer, Konrad Oelsner, who was then in Paris, thought this might be effective with any other nation, but that "German soldiers and Pandours can be taught sense and humanity only through whipping. They are machines without souls, designed solely for murder." Another thought that a troop of tyrannicides might lessen the danger of war by killing some of the tyrants. It was believed that after a few had been assassinated the rest would lose courage and keep the peace.

A more practical way was officially adopted by the Jacobins in June, 1791. The emigrants, gathered on the frontiers of France, now threatened to make trouble for the country they had abandoned. The Jacobins, therefore, drew up an address in the name of all the Jacobin societies of France, in which they made a direct appeal to the people of the neighbouring countries. The latter were asked to drive out the emigrants who were plotting against France. They were assured that the decree of the national assembly ordering the emigrants to return was not intended as a threat against the people who harboured them.

Brothers and Friends, they said, it is they alone [the emigrants] whom we menace with just punishments if they persevere in their hostile designs. To you we announce peace, confidence, union, fraternity. Englishmen, Belgians, Germans, Piedmontese, Spaniards, soldiers of every people, the French and you henceforth

constitute but a single people, a single family whose disunion is no longer possible.

This address was translated into the languages of the various peoples for whom it was designed and distributed to the affiliated societies near the frontiers to be smuggled across, it is to be presumed, as occasion offered.

While the Jacobins thus proclaimed their pacific attitude toward the people of foreign countries they did not aspire to the formal *rôle* of international peacemakers. As one of their journalists, Madame Robert of the *Mercur de France*, said: "They have rendered homage to humanity in preparing the national decree by which, renouncing all spirit of conquest, we swear peace and fraternity to all nations. They do not pretend to the chimerical glory of a pact of the human race; they seek the federative pact of the French." This statement was called forth by the proceedings of a new society which had just been organized, the "Social Circle" or "General Confederation of the Friends of Truth."

In this new organization we have at last a formal peace propaganda. It had chosen for its meeting place the Circus or Riding School of the Palais Royal in Paris, the very heart of the revolution. Its appearance was greeted with enormous enthusiasm. At its first session on October 13, 1790, four to five thousand people attended. At the third session the attendance rose to ten thousand. Its chief

founder was the Abbé of Montfort, Claude Fauchet, a polished but shallow orator desperately bent upon attracting attention to himself. In this he succeeded; but no one seemed able to grasp the exact meaning of his numerous speeches, composed of a mixture of Christianity, Freemasonry, and eighteenth-century French philosophy. The practical, matter-of-fact Bailly, mayor of Paris, thought Fauchet would have been better off if he had learned to "go to bed early and to rise late." The general idea back of the society was, however, clear enough, and it is not difficult to discover the germ out of which it grew. Christianity was common to Europe and one of its fundamental conceptions is the brotherhood of man. The same, in a lesser degree, is true of Freemasonry. There is a suggestion in the evidence that the Social Circle contained as its core the débris of a Masonic lodge which had existed in the same locality, and among its founders, besides Fauchet, are mentioned Condorcet, Goupil de Préfeln, Bonneville, Mailly de Château-Regnaud, and several others, all of whom had been or still were Masons. This made it easier for the Social Circle to appeal to the Masons of other countries and ask them to come to the assistance of the propaganda by emphasizing the fraternal side of their code and by using their influence locally to cause the pacific advances of the revolution to be favourably received.

In its method of procedure the Social Circle followed closely the footsteps of the Jacobins. It adopted an official organ of publicity, which was at the same time to serve as a medium of correspondence. This paper, the *Bouche de Fer* (or *Iron Mouth*), was to receive letters and information from private persons and branch societies, whether in France or elsewhere, and from this material garner the truth for publication. In this way "every system," to use their own expression, was to be reduced to its true or relative value. It was assumed that in the mere knowledge of the truth the world would federate and remain at peace, there being no longer any misunderstandings. An appeal was sent out for all the societies, of whatever nature, to ally themselves with the Social Circle. They seemed on the point of making themselves the headquarters of a huge international propaganda including all the patriotic societies whether moderate or radical. This caused the Jacobins to take alarm for they were not prepared to surrender the leadership they had by this time gained, and they were, moreover, wounded by the arrogant manner in which the editor of the *Bouche de Fer* treated them in his editorials. A violent quarrel ensued and the Social Circle was thus deprived of the co-operation of nearly the whole of the great Jacobin fraternity and of that of the societies following their lead—an eloquent testimony to the futility of world federation. Here

were two peace propagandas, next-door neighbours, who almost came to blows over a question of leadership. It was a severe check but it did not prevent the Social Circle from prosecuting its object. It secured some affiliations in France; and societies are mentioned also in England, Ireland, Scotland, Poland, Germany, Holland, and Belgium. Unfortunately the details of the working of this propaganda have not yet been recovered by historians. We get an idea how these foreign affiliations were obtained from the work of Claude Perroud on the correspondence of Madame Roland. Bancal des Issarts, a friend of the Rolands, had gone to London at the close of 1790. Here, in April, 1791, he received a letter from Fauchet asking him to interest the English societies in his undertaking, to establish communication between them and the Social Circle in order "to conspire for the unity of the human race."

But the Social Circle and the *Bouche de Fer* were already nearing the end of their career. Both went down in the catastrophe of the monarchy, following the flight of the king on June 20, 1791. There was, after all, no room in France for a disinterested internationalism, if such we may call this venture. The initial enthusiasm over, the lofty appeal of the Social Circle fell upon deaf ears or elicited only a derisive response. Few will dissent from the judgment which Prof. Zinkeisen in his picturesque language has laid upon the society.

It wished to march about in the revolutionary swirl, he says, mounted on stilts in order not to besmirch itself in the filth of every-day vulgarities, and sought for the solution of the great problems time had brought forth, in the air, whereas it was necessary to seek for it in the depths of human weaknesses.

Although written more than sixty years ago, have not these words still a message for the pacifists of to-day?

Such was, in outline, the attitude of probably the majority of the revolutionists during 1790 and the first half of 1791. That is, outwardly. It is, no doubt, upon such evidence as we have just given that Professor Aulard of the Sorbonne based his sweeping statement in 1904 that

hardly founded, this new nation [that is, the nation of the revolution] conceived the idea of the federation of all the nations of the world in a single human family in which each national group should preserve its personality. It was then that it was beginning to be said, popularly, that all people are brothers, that they ought to love each other, to aid each other, and not hate and kill each other.

Professor Aulard, social democrat and perpetual advocate of the revolution *in toto*, is necessarily a pacifist who dreams of the "federative pact of the human race" as a guarantee of peace. Strange that so renowned a scholar should never have asked himself whether or not the federation of the world, if it should ever become a reality, would, *ipso facto*,

bring about a universal and permanent peace. History, ancient, mediæval, and modern, refutes such an assumption on almost every page. The world as a whole has never been federated, it is true, but there have been many federated states—that is, groups of states bound together by ties such as we must suppose the pacifists to have in mind. In the Greece of classical times we find a perfect example of this artificial internationalism. In 370 B. C. a number of Arcadian cities established a federal league to take the place of an older system that had grown up naturally during their long wars with Sparta. To create a central point of union they built a new city and called it “Megalopolis,” the “Great City.” One whole tribe removed to this place and emigrants were introduced from all the cities in the league. A federal legislature was created, a federal revenue, and an army of five thousand hoplites provided for. But this did not bring a better understanding or a more effective resistance to the national enemy. On the contrary, the new city aroused the jealousy of the older ones and within twenty years the “Great City” fell into the hands of the Spartans and became a “Great Desert,” as a sarcastic poet said.

Switzerland has always been a confederation of republics, which the pacifists tell us are not war-like, and yet at the time of the Reformation and later the cantons fought among themselves. Mexico is a federal state also composed of republics, and is

nearly always at war unless held in check by a military dictator. Our own country is a union of republics inhabited by an unmilitary and unarmed population. We do not believe in large armaments and will not submit to military training in time of peace. Can the pacifists hope ever to federate the world as closely as the American states were bound together in 1860? Nevertheless we fought a great war from 1861 to 1865. It was primarily the federated German states that were engaged in the Thirty Years' War which, for destructiveness, downright, wanton brutality, and disregard of every human consideration, has no parallel in modern history. Europe, then living under the shadow of Machiavellism, was admittedly not squeamish, but it rose in horror to protest against such a method of warfare. Even a portion of Ireland, member of the English system, was recently prepared for an appeal to arms.

But Professor Aulard need not have gone so far afield for his examples. He could have found them in his own beloved France even during the very revolution he has spent a busy life to defend. The provinces of France federated during the years 1788 to 1790, holding a great national federation on the *Champs de Mars* of Paris on July 14, 1790. On that day there were many embracings, many great oaths were sworn and many tears shed. It was the "federative pact of the French" of which Madame

Robert spoke a few months later. A few weeks after this great national festival this same Champs de Mars was filled with lamentations over the bodies of the dead national guards fallen at Nancy in battle with Frenchmen and Swiss mercenaries "federated" with the French. In three years more the Red Terror was at death's grip with La Vendée, Brittany, Lyons, and other places; and blood, French blood, the blood of the federated, ran in torrents on the battle field and the guillotine.

The pacifists of the revolution came to grief the moment they obtained full possession of the government. For a time their theories, their beautiful professions, captivated the more impressionable minds of Europe. But the delusion soon vanished in the noise and smoke of battle. The Frenchmen brought peace to their neighbours at the point of the bayonet, and the bayonet was followed by a swarm of hungry politicians who soon cured the "slaves" of despots from any predilection they may have had for international federation. The war, begun in April, 1792, lasted, with only brief intervals of peace, until June, 1815, when the battle of Waterloo put an end to the cataclysmal strife.

The pacifists of to-day have gone a step beyond the revolutionists in their opposition to military establishments. Not only are armaments useless, they say, because the people of the different countries do not wish to fight each other, but also be-

cause they provoke war. When they are in the hands of monarchical governments they are the instruments of tyranny. What is needed to assure a permanent universal peace is, first, republican forms of government, and second, disarmament and the suppression of private arms and munition factories. If this argument is valid, how comes it that throughout history the republican states have been, if anything, more warlike than their monarchical contemporaries? The Athenian democracy, the Roman republic, the Italian city states of the Middle Ages, and the Swiss cantons all bear witness to this fact. And during the period of their independent existence have not the United States fought as many wars as, or even more wars than, any of the great military states of Europe? The last body of men the French revolutionists had to conquer before they could finally lay their hands upon Louis XVI was the mercenary guard from republican Switzerland stationed at the Tuileries on August '10, 1792. Great armaments and universal military service in time of peace are the invention of Prussia and were introduced during the middle of the last century. And were there no wars before that date? As good a social democrat and peace-lover as Charles Seignobos of the Sorbonne has stated in a sober historical work that the great armaments have enormously lessened the danger of war. The Orange Free

State and the Boer Republic on the one hand and England on the other, did not have the universal military service or the large standing armies of volunteers. Neither did the United States in 1898. Said the late Professor J. A. Cramb of England: "In the nineteenth century there is a long series of wars—in the Crimea, in India, and Afghanistan, in China, in New Zealand, in Egypt, in Western and in Southern Africa; so that it might be said without exaggeration that through all these years scarcely a sun set which did not look upon some Englishman's face dead in battle." Can the most rabid pacifist bring an indictment like this against that blackest of all iniquities "Prussian Militarism"?

The pacifists of America, having been convicted of false prophecy, now predict anew that the present war is the great, final catastrophe, the darkness before the millennial dawn. After it is over, they say, general disarmament is certain to take place. To those who feel somewhat uneasy over the comparative unpreparedness of the United States the pacifist replies with his usual facility and assurance:

Your fear arises from your colossal ignorance and incapacity for sound reasoning. Can you not see that all the great military and naval powers will exhaust themselves utterly in the conflict now going on? Bankrupt in men and money and held in the firm grip of their mutual hatreds, the European nations will not be, for a long time to come, in condition to attack America.

This argument is, no doubt, convincing to a large number of people who are either predisposed to this view or too indifferent to give it serious attention. As a matter of fact a moment's consideration shows the contention to be utterly absurd. For, despite the losses in men, wealth, and munitions of war, the conflict might continue for several years without seriously weakening any of the great powers involved in it. When peace is made all prisoners of war will be restored and there will then be an immensely greater number of trained fighters than at the beginning of the war. The proportion of those killed or badly maimed is very small and the present war seems to be less destructive of life than most wars have been, numbers considered. Prisoners aside, the great powers will find new men arriving at maturity almost as fast as others are killed or permanently disabled at the front. The margin of difference is so small as to make the reduction in the number of fighting men at the end of the war so inconsiderable as to merit little attention in gauging the fighting strength of the nation. Moreover, no great war of history has ever ended because the supply of able-bodied men had been exhausted. The final reserve strength of the nation, whether in men or munitions of war, is never called in. The contest is decided by the greater momentum or superior position gained by one of the parties to the war. Reserve strength is of no value if it cannot be employed, and it is only

in the reserve strength that the belligerent nations are being weakened, strange as that may sound. All the powers involved, with the possible exception of Serbia, can strike a much harder blow to-day than they could when the war began, and any one of them would now be a more dangerous enemy to an unprepared neutral than before a shot was fired or a man killed.

With regard to national hatreds it is only those who are totally blind to the lessons of history who cannot see that wars do more toward allaying than toward creating them. The error is natural to the pacifists who look upon war as a disease, whereas it is at most a symptom, an evidence of disease—a violent proceeding on the part of the body politic to cast out a disturbing element of some kind. This war is not producing national hatreds, and none existed except between England and Germany. To-day, seven months after the war began, German and Englishman are fraternizing in the trenches between the intervals of fighting. The war is creating mutual understanding and respect as each discovers unsuspected virtues in his antagonist. So it has been in the past. Our war with Spain brought to end nearly a century of friction and ill feeling between the two countries. The Boers held a standing grudge against England before the South African war. They are for the most part loyal supporters of England to-day when a war for inde-

pendence would almost certainly succeed. Thirty or more years of ill feeling preceded our civil war, growing more intense as the moment for the clash drew near. The war, in removing the cause of the strife, has brought, not only good will, but mutual admiration. Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler has recently declared that this war was a mistake; that the question at issue could have been solved without an appeal to arms, and that, therefore, this conflict between federated states does not militate against the assumption that the federation of the world would bring peace. Most assuredly! And by parity of reasoning we can prove with equal facility that not a single evil need necessarily exist to plague mankind. If man were different it is probable that his history would be different. But unfortunately for the pacifists history does not deal with a hypothetical race. We have to do with hard, positive facts. There is no warrant for reading a potential into the past. The potential in history is merged and lost in the actual—there is no room for a potential which is not realized in the actual. The course of history is the fulfilment of the imperative mandate of evolution; it is the curve traced by the final resultant of all the forces acting upon and through man. It is, therefore, absurd to speak of the civil war as a thing that might have been avoided. If history is to enlighten us we cannot quarrel with her verdict in such fashion. But the confusion of

thought in the mind of Dr. Butler is common among pacifists and constitutes one of their fundamental errors. They attack a great historic institution before they have attained to a clear understanding of the only principle according to which historical facts can be assigned a scientific value.

To return to the point, namely, American immunity guaranteed by the war in Europe. Our modern pacifists are not the first to undergo this illusion, for here also the French revolution furnishes us with an exact parallel. On July 10, 1791, Brissot de Warville, the well-informed editor of the *Patriote Français*, delivered a long speech at the Jacobins on the inviolability of Louis XVI, who, some thought, had committed a crime in fleeing from Paris a few weeks before. Among the arguments advanced against punishing the king was the fear that such action would bring on war. Brissot, besides contemptuously rejecting the thought of fear on the part of a free people, held that there was no danger of war because no country was in condition to attack France. He went through the whole list of possible enemies and found none anywhere who was either capable or likely to undertake serious operations. Beginning with England he found her impotent because Ireland was in perpetual rebellion and was imitated by India. The Scotch were emigrating in large numbers, while an enormous and ever increasing debt left her hardly sufficient re-

sources for holding together her shaking empire. Besides, the mass of Englishmen would hold a war with France in execration. This of the country that formed the backbone of the long struggle of Europe against revolutionary France and the empire of Napoleon which supplanted it!

Holland, he said, was ruled by a shameless and imperious woman, an imbecile and despised prince, a states-general of slaves, an odious magisterial aristocracy, two aristocratic factions ready to fly at each other's throats, a seditious *canaille* subject to the orders of the prince, no money, no credit, no ships, no troops, two bankrupt companies [the great chartered Indian companies, no doubt], and a shaken bank,—such is the government of Holland.

The dreaded Prussia was now ruled by a superstitious and voluptuous king, was exhausted in resources and divided in counsel. Prussia had, moreover, nothing to gain from an attack upon France. Her real enemy was Austria. So also he found reason to declare positively that none of the other countries, Austria, Sweden, the Germanic Confederation, Spain, Sardinia, would cause France any trouble. On the contrary, the despotic rulers feared the contagion of French liberty and would not risk contact with it through war. Their soldiers would certainly make comparisons and then, woe to tyranny!

The Jacobins were much impressed with this speech. They printed it and sent copies to their

numerous affiliated societies, just as peace societies to-day print and circulate some of the speeches delivered at their sessions.

Nine months after the date of Brissot's speech France was at war with Austria. Four months after the declaration of war, that is, toward the close of August, 1792, Paris was in imminent danger of capture by the rapidly advancing Prussians and Austrians and was saved probably as much by the Duke of Brunswick's dislike of his task as by his inability to advance. It was the beginning of the great conflict extending over nearly a quarter of a century. And Brissot was arrogantly certain—spoke with the assurance and contempt of his opponents which characterize the pacifists of to-day—that Europe was not able to make war!

Even at the close of February, 1792, Pitt, the able English minister, declared officially that the prospect for continued peace in Europe was unusually good.

I said at the beginning that modern pacifism is a by-product of social democracy. It is not an essential part of its dogma. The radical wing of the revolution adopted it, not from a sincere moral conviction, but from considerations of party advantage. So, also, the European socialists of to-day are anti-militarists, not because they are more squeamish about the use of force than are mankind generally, but because the army seems to stand in

the way of their aspirations as a party. Their failure to live up to their avowed principles when the present war broke out was, therefore, not an accident. There was no real conviction to overbalance the motives which urged them into the war. Their international fraternalism was based on party interest, not on a genuine brotherly feeling. The origin of the party, its history from the time of the revolution to the present, should have warned the pacifists of America to stand outside of the party, that their hope of peace enforced by European socialism rested upon an extremely fragile base, or rather upon a false assumption.

The same spurious pacifism is noticeable among the socialists and labour parties in the United States. Men who will not gag at the work of the dynamiter and the midnight assassin take umbrage at the existence of the national guards because these guards stand as the only effective barrier against the lawlessness of striking workmen. And the doctrinaire pacifists, in need of support, place themselves behind these incendiaries in demanding the abolition of the guards. The whole is done in the name of "anti-militarism." What the movement really stands for, in a practical sense, is anarchy. This, too, is not strange, for the socialists and anarchists of Europe were at one time gathered in the same fold, so near were their principles alike. It was not until after a prolonged parliamentary

struggle and a formal vote that the anarchists were excluded from the ranks of the socialists.

It is at this point that we discover the cardinal weakness of the pacifists' position. Their ground is tenable only under the assumption that mankind desires justice and will live up to its requirements without compulsion. International morality always has been and still is notoriously below that of the average individual. A crowd will commit acts its component members would be ashamed to commit as individuals. But even the best individuals are far from voluntary subjection to the principles of justice. Our courts are crowded with litigants and it is an accepted fact that the losers usually submit only because the force of society stands back of the court's decree. Evasion is practised wherever possible. Justice is not a thing which acts automatically. It must be enforced wherever interests clash. Municipal law is a law of force both in actual practice and in historical development, and the pacifist who seeks to extend its machinery and procedure to the domain of international relations simply ignores this fact. The Hague conferences have shown that it is an easy matter to establish an international court and to legislate upon international objects. But the war shows that such a court and such legislation are absolutely worthless. More, even. The advanced principles advocated at these conferences, having been disregarded by various

belligerents, have themselves become the basis of violent recriminations which at this moment threaten to lead to deplorable reprisals. In trying to crowd our international legislation beyond the natural or moral standard we are suffering the same setback experienced whenever the municipal legislator passes too far beyond the demands of his community. Such impatience does not make for peace and quiet progress. It leads to lawlessness, to contempt for law, back to anarchy, to violence. It is, therefore, possible that Mr. Roosevelt is right in thinking that the net result of the pacifist movement will be international friction rather than peace. The rules of international intercourse, imperfect as they are, are nevertheless precious. They did not spring, a completed code, from the brain of some doctrinarian, but were hammered out through ages of conflict. They do not embody the highest moral concepts the philosopher has reached in the seclusion of his study. On the contrary, they smell of the earth; they reek with the sweat and the blood of the multitudes who have contributed toward their establishment; they are human and therefore serviceable. Before, at the behest of pacifism, we cast them aside as worthless junk, it is worth while to ask pacifism itself for reasonable guarantees. For pacifism does not mean reform. It means revolution.

Pacifism is at present seeking to exchange its French dress for one of Anglo-Saxon cut. Instead

of world federation through the emotions, through fraternal sentiments, more stress is now being laid upon what they are pleased to call "common interests." This phrase is impressive only so long as we are not disposed to become analytical. For what are "common interests"? Is not an interest, from its very nature a separatist, or exclusive, thing? Two or more parties may be interested in the same object, but in that case their interests will be parallel or rival rather than common, and more likely to furnish a basis for war than for peace. It is just such a situation which is at present at the bottom of the trouble between England and Germany. The common objects are world trade and colonial empire. As a matter of fact it is difficult to imagine why nations should fight each other except for these common interests, whether material or otherwise. We have been often assured that the intellectual and artistic interests would never again permit the people of Europe to engage in mutual slaughter. In this field, it was said, no national boundaries existed. We find instead that the European scholars are more bellicose, if anything, than the men in the trenches. Nor does either art or education receive much respect at the hands of the contending forces. The cathedral of Rheims, with its peculiar interest to artists and architects, receives rather more than its share of German shells, and the university of Louvain is said to be largely

a heap of ashes. In both cases the destruction appears as unprovoked and deliberate, showing that Germany does not regard art in France or education in Belgium as of much interest to her.

On the whole, these "common interests," material, intellectual, and artistic, began their rapid growth with the Renaissance and the age of discovery. The same period saw the rise of the national state into full consciousness and was marked by a series of great wars and national rivalries.

The final goal of pacifism seems to be a federated and unarmed world kept in submission by a federal police force. Those who advocate this scheme thus voluntarily surrender their case on the question of force *versus* justice, since their ultimate appeal is to force. They have come to the sane conclusion that justice receives no consideration anywhere unless she comes with a policeman at her back. As to how this federation is to be effected we are not told, as far as I am aware, and I cannot here go into the endless difficulties such a scheme would seem destined to encounter. But supposing it to have been put into operation, are we certain that the gain would overbalance the loss? Would it not almost of necessity lead to the end of free institutions and local self-government? Would it not mark the complete surrender of the Anglo-Saxon idea to the Latin principle of centralization? For, be it observed, this international police force is designed for the express

purpose of crushing nationalism. It would not stand in the same relation to the national states that our regular army stands toward the States of the Union. The founders of our government were careful to leave weapons in the hands of the people so that tyranny should never find them helpless. Our regular army is not designed as an instrument so obviously overwhelming as to make resistance hopeless even to men rendered desperate by oppression. The Anglo-Saxon people have always been leaders in freedom, the champions of free institutions. At the bottom of their creed lies the belief that oppression is sure to follow the opportunity for exercising it. That opportunity, we are now told, must be given to an international police force. For, unless this force is made so powerful as to inspire abject fear, it cannot, of course, fulfil its purpose of preventing war. Its commander will be master of the world and trample it under foot, if he so chooses. His army of millions of men must be composed of mercenaries who have emancipated themselves from the old-fashioned weakness of patriotism or they could not be depended on to serve where their sympathies should be involved. Imperial Rome at one time seemed to threaten the world with the stagnation which necessarily follows the suppression of healthy rivalry and the curbing of individualistic tendencies due to racial characteristics and local conditions. But the Rome of the Cæsars could not disarm the world; and Germany, whose

ambitions we suspect to-day, is not likely to succeed where Rome failed under the more favourable conditions seventeen or eighteen hundred years ago. And if we dread the universal empire of Germany as long as we possess our weapons, what shall we not fear when we have given them into the hands of a colossal mercenary force which owes no allegiance except to the man who commands it? And we must make this step irrevocable, we are told. There must be no arms-factories except those in control of this army. After we take this plunge there is no returning. We shall no longer have the power to fight for our convictions, to refuse to do that against which our conscience rebels. For the sake of outward peace, for the sake of mere existence, we surrender all our higher moral and spiritual aspirations. If this is the price of peace, as it seems to me to be if we accept the pacifists' prescription, are we resigned to paying it?

II

THE SCOPE AND TENDENCY OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT

It is a mistake to regard pacifism as a movement concerned only with the question of war and peace. The suppression of war is only one of its aims, and to my mind, by no means its most important one. War is a cataclysmic event which forcibly impresses the popular mind and therefore lends itself easily to passionate denunciation of scapegoats and social conditions generally. For that reason it has so far borne the brunt of the pacifist attack. The larger objective of pacifism is nothing less than a complete social revolution merging at many points into socialism, communism, and the "Internationale."

"When we understand how the distortion of the false philosophy of force has spread all through the social structure," says Dr. Nasmyth, "we shall realize that all social workers have at bottom the same task—the establishment of a true philosophy of social, political, and international justice, as the basis for the reconstruction and redemption of human society. The peace movement, with its goal of world federation, is the *unifying thesis of all social reform*, and from a realization of this fact and

the resulting co-operation of all forces making for social progress may be expected an unparalleled accession of power and rapidity of advance. Social workers have been justly compared by Mr. Hobhouse to a number of guerilla bands, striving at cross-purposes, and even warring against each other, but with the coming of the *intellectual revolution* they will be transformed into an army of social reform, irresistible in the strength of its unity and of its demand for righteousness and justice as the universal principle of the expansion of life.

"The reconstruction of ideas must precede the reconstruction of society, however, and it is to this intellectual revolution and the indispensable clarification of thought that we must first direct our attention. Thus far we have been engaged in a detailed examination of the errors of the philosophy of force—biological, sociological, political, economic, and moral. Following this work of destruction, the clearing of the ground of the ruins of the old structure in order to make way for the new, we shall proceed to a study of Darwin's true theory of social progress, as a basis for the establishment of the new and liberating philosophy of justice."¹

This is, I believe, a fair statement of both the meaning and the method of the peace movement. It is the "unifying thesis of all social reform" (as

¹ *Social Progress and the Darwinian Theory*, p. 238. The italics in the quotation are mine.

the pacifists see it) and represents an "intellectual revolution." Anyone who has read much pacifist literature will have received this impression. Dr. Nasmyth does not flinch in the presence of the staggering burden of proof. He names the whole list of basic social sciences and denounces them one and all as false because based on the philosophy of force. In the essay on "The Rational Causes and Functions of War" I have tried to show in part how he has executed the task he here assumes.

There is, then, to be first an intellectual revolution and next a social revolution. But, if we are to judge from pacifist works generally, it is not clear what the nature of intellectual revolution really is. There are, roughly speaking, two general methods of approaching social data, the subjective-intuitional or theological, and the objective or evolutionary. Both are represented in the attack upon the "philosophy of force." Dr. Nasmyth is a democrat, a member of the old school of liberals, who is greatly dissatisfied with the product of liberalism. Although he has entirely emancipated himself from the dogmatic theological ethics, he cannot rid himself altogether of its abstract terminology. His book gives an instructive illustration of the difficulties into which the old political liberal has fallen. The dearest object of the political liberal was and still is the freedom of the individual. He has always believed that this freedom could be attained and

protected through the ballot. He has, therefore, called for democracy, ever more democracy, meaning thereby an ever wider extension of the franchise. Long vaguely conscious that this did not fully meet the issue, that there was something amiss somewhere, he has not been able to discover just what it is that is lacking. Jeered by the political conservative from the one side and menaced by the different schools of radicals from the other, he has never found anything better than to raise the old cry of "democracy versus autocracy." His long struggle with political absolutism taught him the necessity and the possibilities of mass action in removing artificial obstructions. His work was good as far as it went. But it did not go far enough. He perfected his political machinery with sole attention to the free expression of the will. He did not trouble himself enough to see that the will was backed by information and good individual conduct both private and public. He failed to see that, while the pressing concern of mankind is economic, voting is not a very satisfactory method of making bread. Men must eat individually, not collectively, and that implies individual ability to find bread unless someone is to starve or be fed at the expense of someone else. It would not be true to say that the political liberal did not concern himself with this. He did not want anyone to starve. But he did not trouble himself greatly to learn why people

starved. He contented himself, as a rule, with the observation that the cause lay in the imperfection of the political machinery—more democracy. All this time the ground was giving way under his feet. Others began to see a little more clearly on the constructive side of the problem. They raised the economic issue of distribution directly into the political field. This was an advance of a sort because it implied the admission that the old issue of political liberty is dead. But the old dyed-in-the-wool political liberal did not comprehend the full meaning of this shifting of ground. He accepted it and directed his thunders against the “economic autocrats.” This was cause for secret congratulations among the socialists of every school or color. It contained an admission that implied all but complete surrender. If economic autocracy exists, why not use the good old liberal method of mass action, mass control, in the economic field? In that case we need not change our old slogans or general terminology. “Liberty,” “justice,” “democracy,” versus “autocracy” (meaning economic autocracy) will do very well. We can appeal to the old emotion complexes and save the trouble of hard thinking. It arouses the people. It gets the votes, and whatever the people vote, that is right, for that is democracy.²

²After this essay had been completed I received from the hands of a friend a copy of Mr. Harold Cox's *Economic Liberty*, published in 1920. On pp. 170-171 occurs the following passage which hits the nail squarely on the head:

Such has been our practice, and is still, for that matter. But it has ceased to be altogether satisfactory. We are beginning to have misgivings. The radicals have taken us at our word and have added an adjective to our key-word and now call for "Industrial Democracy" as the logical fulfilment of our theory. They want the workmen in each industry to have a voice in its management. It is a limited sovietism and entirely in accord with the utterances of spokesmen of political democracy in recent times. But the political liberal of the old school is bewildered and shocked. The more he has thundered

"People talk to-day, apparently without any sense of incongruity, as if liberty from the constitutional point of view meant the multiplication of electors and elections. Perfect constitutional liberty will be attained—so at least these modern liberals imply—when every person, male or female, is entitled to vote for one or more parliaments and a plethora of local administrative bodies. It is further assumed, or more often expressly stated, that these parliaments and local bodies are all to be busy doing things, and as the action of every governing body is in one form or other coercive action, it follows that what is now called constitutional liberty really means an elaborate organization for giving everybody an equal opportunity of sharing in the frequent coercion of everybody else.

"This habitual inversion of the meaning of the word liberty is so complete that it would be an excess of politeness to describe it as being due to loose thinking. It is due to loose speaking and no thinking at all. By American presidents as well as by Hyde Park tub-thumpers democracy and liberty are mentioned in one breath as if they represented the same ideal. They may both be ideals, but they are not the same."

Then, after saying that liberty and autocracy are not necessarily incompatible, that under the Roman emperors a large part of the world enjoyed as much liberty as do the citizens of the United States and that autocratically ruled India is freer than England itself, he declares that "Democracy in fact is at present moving rapidly in the direction of tyranny."

against autocracy the greater has grown the menace against his cherished ideal of individual liberty. The cuckoo has left an egg in his nest and he has stupidly overlooked it.

At about the time the last really harmful vestiges of absolutism disappeared from Western civilization, and while the political liberal was still chattering about liberty and fulminating against tyranny, a scientific revolution was begun which has rendered his way of approaching his problem obsolete. A new political science has grown up in harmony with the other social sciences based on the evolutionary hypothesis. Subjectivism, intuitionism everywhere gave way to accurate observation of objective reality. But the political liberal took no notice. He clung to his abstractions, his absolutes, and allowed the radicals to pre-empt the field exposed by the economists and especially by the sociologists. Having obtained political liberty he seemed not to know what to do with it. He imagined that if the free individual were left to his own devices everything would be well. He established free public schools, to be sure, but these schools failed to drive home with sufficient emphasis the truth about individualism and the conditions necessary for its survival. Political liberty will preserve individual liberty, he said, failing to remark that everything depended on what the individual did with his liberty. If he did not maintain his individual liberty in his extra-political ac-

tivities he could hardly hope to retain his political liberty. If he could not refrain from wronging others or protect himself from being wronged, if he could not take a hard knock without whining, if he remained ignorant, shiftless, pleasure loving and easy of exploitation by others, his individual liberty would necessarily disappear in regulatory legislation. And that is just what has actually happened. "Self-government" means just what it says, "government of self." If the individual is weak, irresponsible and inclined to whine at hardships, to side-step his obvious private and public duties, he will ultimately be enslaved no matter how often or how freely he votes. This is what our public men should have preached in and out of season. Instead of this they have persistently hinted at the futility of individual effort in social matters. The result was inevitable. The individual, finding himself thus always excused, his personal responsibility depreciated, has ended by becoming discouraged, and has accepted the view that he must look to society for everything. Hence we find the field of personal liberty rapidly narrowing as a result of the constant encroachments of social action and in danger of being wiped out completely.³ Thus socialism,

³ The Nebraska legislature in 1921, for instance, had before it fifty-four "Social Welfare" bills, and twenty-one bills directly interfering with private business, that is, regulating. Senator W. V. Hoagland, in opposing a certain "Blue Sky" bill, said, "We now have eighteen state officers sticking their

collective tyranny, is growing up as the child of political liberalism itself.

Now, it may be asked, what has all this to do with pacifism and the "Intellectual Revolution"? The answer is that the process I have described is the intellectual revolution in action. The destruction of personal liberty I have noted is the work of the liberals and radicals who make up the bulk of the pacifists, and who now sometimes style themselves the "New Democrats." The "New Democracy" is the democratic-pacifist merger effected under the leadership of President Wilson during the war. It is this merger which is everywhere pressing the movement for a more rigid social control. On the intellectual side it is based largely on the works of a class of sociologists who emphasize the distinguishing characteristic of their science, co-operation, social action, at the expense of individual action.⁴ We all talk and rant a good deal about tentacles into every community and regulating common ordinary business."

It is interesting to note that Nebraska has had a "Blue Sky" law for some years. Nevertheless it is estimated that during the year 1920 the J. Rufus Wallingfords sold Nebraskans ninety million dollars' worth of blue sky!

⁴ It may seem to some readers that I am making too much of this point; that most people are not conscious of any undue interference of government with the affairs of the individual. One or two cases of which I have personal knowledge will make clear what is meant by those who oppose the present tendency to "regulate" everything.

Some years ago the Montana legislature passed a law regulating dairies as most other states have done. This law minutely specified the kind of dairy barn, the treatment of the cows, the disposal of the refuse, etc., for the production

socialism. Well, we are today proceeding on the socialist theory. All we lack to be good socialists

of legally salable milk. This law was very exasperating to many dairymen with small herds and undoubtedly put many of them out of business without in any degree protecting the consumer against contaminated milk. As one dairyman said to me: "I can comply with every one of the regulations and still sell the worst kind of milk, and, on the other hand, I can disregard them all and sell a perfect product." This man remained in the business only because the local inspector was a sensible Scotchman who disregarded the requirements of the law because he knew the man could be trusted to do the right thing. Since this law was passed milk has certainly risen greatly in price in Montana as it has elsewhere under regulation, and this in spite of the fact that dairying has received unusual attention by the agricultural colleges and that the introduction of the silo has furnished a cheap milk-producing ration all but unknown a decade or so ago. Quarrels between producers and consumers of milk are now chronic chiefly because of the high price. The regulatory laws have driven out of business so many people that dairying is now chiefly the work of experts with costly equipment. No doubt some lives were saved by these laws. Those who make their living from the enforcement of these laws are naturally loud in their praise. There is no one to tell us how many babies and children have been starved into disease or stunted because their parents could not buy any milk at all at present prices.

About the same time the dairy law was passed by the Montana legislature another was adopted regulating fruit packing. It looked very innocent and no doubt the fruit dealers and city consumers thought it a very wise and just law and much to their own advantage. As a matter of fact it was a vicious piece of legislation which condemned hundreds of thousands of bushels of perfectly good apples on the eastern slope of the Rockies to the feeding pens, or to rot on the ground, and made hundreds of orchards a liability instead of an asset. The idea of the law evidently was to standardize the apple pack in Montana on the basis of the pack on the Pacific coast where climate permits the growing of large fancy apples. These varieties cannot be successfully produced on the eastern side of the Rockies in this latitude, although the varieties that are grown are in no way inferior to the coast product except in size and color, a thing to which a sensible consumer is indifferent. But the regulations as to grades condemned most of these apples to "seconds" or

is courage and consistency. The large majority of us would be shocked to discover this just as many

"culls," and, therefore, made them all but unsalable because the buyer did not understand. The size of the crate was specified and the number of apples it must be packed with, necessitating extra expense and loss of time. In this matter I can speak from personal experience. At the very time this law was passed people were enthusiastically planting orchards. These orchards, if I am to judge from what I have seen, have in most cases been abandoned or uprooted as have many of the bearing orchards. Why this should be done when apples imported from the coast sell at from two to four dollars per crate is hard to understand unless one understands how the local product has been forced off the market by legislative fiat. There are still some locally grown apples sold, but not nearly as many as would be sold had there not been this interference, and the price is certainly higher.

Such details do not usually get into the papers. The law does its destructive work quietly and in the dark, and not only the producer but the consumer as well pays for the costly meddling.

And in the long run such legislation neither improves the product nor encourages honesty in the producer. The moment a cast iron standard is set up by law the producer ceases to have much of an incentive to surpass this standard. The best of them have always produced something better than the standard, but few people will pay them anything above the price of the stereotyped article. So he will, in most cases, content himself with the production of the standard. The consumer, on the other hand, by no means always gains protection from the law. Dishonest men will usually find means of evading the law in some way while observing the form of it. The consumer will be less wary, for, seeing that the article bears the external earmarks legally required, will tacitly assume that the law has been complied with and ask no questions. He ceases to look out for himself after the law all along the line has assumed the task of looking after him. And so another step has been taken to reduce the citizen to the condition of a helpless babe. That is the inevitable effect of all such legislation. Thus social action, in seeking to protect the individual, tends to make him progressively less capable of protecting himself and so create ever greater need for society to interfere in his behalf until individual freedom vanishes in the tyranny of the hive.

Laws of this type should be strictly confined to products

of the old political liberals were shocked when, after having applauded President Wilson's war program and speeches, they learned what they were "being let in for," to use Mr. Lansing's phrase. There is a hopeful sign in the sharp warnings sounded here and there by men of courage who have retained their balance in the midst of the emotional wave caused by the war.

To bring our discussion back to the immediate point in hand, pacifism is "the unifying thesis of all social reform," and this reform is initiated by the multitude of social workers under the thumb of the one sided sociologists, scattered over the land in thousands of clubs, societies, associations. The voting population is divided into fads or propagandas each one determined to see how many new laws it can place on the statute books. They bombard legislatures and Congress with resolutions and often present complete drafts of laws. On the question of peace and war they have only one voice—"the unifying thesis of all social reform" in action.

This breaking up of the electorate into propagandist groups does not seem to me a desirable thing in itself. It gets results, no doubt, but it does so at the expense of individual thought, and therefore, has a tendency to lower the quality of the individual

that may be harmfully adulterated in such a way that the consumer, even when exercising the best care, cannot protect himself. The matter of grade or quality should be left entirely to buyer and seller.

elector both in the matter of intelligence and the feeling of personal responsibility. But the most menacing feature of the situation is found in the movement to carry the propaganda into the schools with special emphasis on the pacifist element in it. The confusion and danger is increased by the merging of pacifism with democracy by official act of our president. This supplies a ready excuse for any teacher or professor who has mistaken his calling to indulge in propaganda to his heart's content. There is evidence in abundance that advantage is being taken of this opening. The movement is not new. Professor Edward Krehbiel shows in *Nationalism, War, and Society*, Chap. XXIX, that individual pacifists and peace societies have been at work for a long time to influence public instruction in the direction of peace. It does not seem, however, that anything of a very pronounced propagandist nature was intended in these earlier efforts. Until about ten or twelve years ago the whole pacifist movement was comparatively sane. It was dominated by men with scholarly habits of thought, men who wanted to know and teach the truth. Whatever bias they had they received from an honest search. As long as the pacifists maintained this attitude there was no very great objection to giving them a hearing in the schools. For, while the ideal teacher is one who can present the truth in an entirely detached manner, not much harm would result from

an honest presentation of a personal view based on serious study.

But that is not the spirit and manner in which the propaganda is going about the work today. The method used now resembles that of the political "barnstormer." The presentation is emotional and based on selected data consciously unrepresentative. Some time ago I received a letter from a professor in one of our large universities dealing with this subject. He wrote, among other things, "As for propaganda: I don't believe there is anything of consequence at the universities. There are organizations that shower us with pamphlets of all kinds, so many that we can't very well read them all. Some of the material is excellent source material." Again, "As a matter of fact, I don't think the universities are a good field for propaganda. The professors are too individual and even the students do not go quite mad. They have a way of catching on more or less. But the high schools and grammar schools—that is where the poison takes full possession of them, including the teachers. I am amazed at the little high school hotheads, who know *nothing*, but who are as full of prejudices as an egg of meat. When they introduce economics and civics into the lower grades, as they threaten to do, then Heaven help us. The bolsheviki have shown what can be done in that line."

Professor Krehbiel, in the work mentioned a mo-

ment ago, complains that historians are wrongfully perpetuating the war tradition. They give too much space to war, he says, while neglecting the less obtrusive but more important factors in development. There is a grain of truth in this, but Professor Krehbiel would have inspired greater confidence in himself had he given a truthful explanation of the fact. The large amount of space given to war is not due to a predilection of the historian for cataclysmic events. He was compelled to work with the material at his disposal, and this material had to do mostly with war and political events hinging on war. Until recent years most history has been political history on that account, and also because certain auxiliary sciences were not sufficiently advanced to offer a firm basis for the intelligent interpretation of the available evidence in other fields of history. Moreover, a large part of this ground has been satisfactorily covered by the students of economics, sociology and a number of other sciences.

On the other hand it can hardly be said that war has received too much attention. Dr. Krehbiel himself, though a professor of history in one of our great universities, gives unmistakable evidence that some rather important facts about war have not yet been fully grasped by him. In discussing the medieval knight he says, "Knights did not fight to kill, but to capture for ransom. They and their steeds were armored; and hence they had little fear

of injury. They had only to fear accidental and unintentional injury. When firearms, which were really dangerous, were invented, the knights abandoned the prerogative of being the fighters and hired mercenaries to wage war."

Are we not justified in thinking that this is the kind of history teaching we may look for when the pacifists gain control of the schools? Here are seven separate statements of which three are wholly false, two partially false, one of a nature precluding a positive affirmation, and only one substantially true. It is true that the knights, and *as a rule*, their steeds, were armored. Whether or not they feared injury only the knights themselves could say positively and they are no longer here to tell us about it. They did not fight only to capture for ransom. The ransom was an incidental except among the outlaw robber knights. They did not always have vassals to pay their ransoms. Large numbers of them were attached directly to the military establishments and households of some nobleman and served for pay in one form or other. When they were captured they either paid their ransoms themselves or were ransomed by the nobleman in whose service they stood. When their vassals paid their ransoms they did so on exactly the same principle on which every people now pay for a military disaster, namely increased taxes. That they fought to kill and were often killed, is evidenced by their

appalling losses in many battles, such as the battle of Poitiers, Cressy, and Azincourt during the Hundred Years' War between France and England, and the battle of Courtrai between the French and the Flemish Burghers. Thousands of them perished in the crusades by disease, famine and the weapons of the enemy. So heavy was their loss that it caused a marked social and political readjustment in some parts of Europe. A conflict between two bodies of knights was a ghastly affair in which the majority of them probably were tumbled from their horses one or more times. If the weapons with which they were struck failed to penetrate their armor they still ran a good chance of breaking their necks in their fall unless they happened to wear flexible chain armor, which was not usual during the latter part of the middle ages. Once down he was seldom able to mount again without assistance, and if very heavily armored could not even regain his feet. If an enemy foot soldier was able to reach him while down he was usually killed with a dagger run between the joints of the armor. Nor is it true that his armor always protected him from injury. Lances often penetrated the armor, as did the heavier arrows of the long bow, and the bill and mace were both deadly weapons to the man clad in the heaviest armor. It is not true that the knight abandoned his "prerogative" of fighting when firearms were invented. In the first place fighting was never his

exclusive prerogative. As a matter of fact he was usually accompanied by unarmored foot soldiers, archers, slingers, pikemen, etc., who outnumbered him many times. The introduction of effective fire-arms easily loaded and aimed by the average man, merely caused him to lose his prestige as the decisive factor in battle. His class has continued down to the present day as a warrior class. The German army was officered chiefly by the "Junkers," country gentlemen, the descendants of the knightly class, and they died like flies during the World War. The officers of the English expeditionary force came from the same class and they died as bravely as their Prussian opponents.

And this is practically all a pacifist historian has to tell us about the significance of knighthood, the knight, and the kind of warfare he waged! What is the object of such a travesty on history? He states it in almost so many words. He wants to counteract the impression produced by the over-drawn pictures of the knight in romance. Romance perpetuates the false glamor of war, and to remove this undesirable effect he light heartedly presented the knight as a contemptible *poseur* who never really fought, and if he had fought could have done so without risk to life or limb! Not a word about the code of chivalry, the effect it had upon the sense of honor, or the profound change it helped to bring about in the position of woman. Romance, as we

know it, is essentially a product of chivalry, and it has done more than any other single factor to refine the relations between man and woman and protect the latter from the brutalities to which she was subjected for ages. Knighthood, through its code and through the example of the knight, set in motion forces which have metamorphosed the sex instinct so that what was at one time almost wholly brutal and to a large extent unnecessarily destructive, has come to be a large factor in civilization. A little reading of fiction will convince any one that chivalry is not dead, though it is sometimes spurned in quarters where we should expect it to be welcomed. The fickle sex is often accused of heartlessness and ingratitude, but in its predilection for the warrior as a mate it displays a broad sense of justice when we view the matter in the long historical perspective. The modern woman exercises her prerogative of inconsistency by condemning war intellectually and clinging to the warrior by preference, deep-dyed though his hands may be in the blood of other women's sons.

Now, the true historian simply cannot and *must* not tolerate this sort of thing. "Pragmatic" history at its best is not very good history. But this is not even honest pragmatic history such as we find in the works of Thucydides, Polybios, Tacitus, Plutarch, and the best writers of classical antiquity generally. These men wrote their histories to "point a moral

and to adorn a tale," but they did not consciously falsify or distort. They picked their data, not with the object of a full presentation, but to prove a point in morals or politics, but as far as they went they were as accurate as they knew how to be. Our propagandists want to put us back more than two thousand years. Even when left to himself it is difficult enough for the most impartial teacher to keep his personal bias entirely under control. What, then, must be his plight after he has fallen a victim to an active and unscrupulous propaganda backed by large funds, organized on an international basis, charged with a tremendous emotional tension involving all the inflammatory elements of the class conflict? Unless we have gone stark, staring mad we shall certainly not permit this proposed outrage upon the present and future students. The teacher who persists in bringing his mental squint into the class room should be promptly discharged unless he amends his ways. Academic freedom does not cover fraud and the prostitution of science to objects foreign to that science. And it does not matter in the least whether the propaganda is pacifism, militarism, democracy, or what you please. No propaganda of any kind is wanted. The duty of the teacher is to take the data as he finds them, select a *representative* portion if he cannot use them all, and present it to his students with the truest interpretation he is capable of making, no matter

what the conclusion may be. It is not the business of the teacher of a social science to provide the student with a ready-made cast iron formula for his guidance in current politics. He is not to mark the student's ballot for him. It would be simpler and less expensive to let the teacher do the voting. The object of education here is to inform and train the mind to find its way alone in the confused and ever shifting scene.

Pacifism is not the only offender against the integrity of education. Its special menace lies precisely in the fact that the schools are already more or less demoralized by the class conflict. It comes as the "unifying thesis" on the radical side of the attack. The conservatives also are interfering, so that unless prompt and vigorous action is taken in the matter the schools will run the risk of soon degenerating into debating societies and become finally nothing but the tools of one party or other. A liberal professor of history and sociology in one of our western colleges wrote me about a year ago that he believed the conservatives were making a concerted effort to oust every liberal teacher from the school and universities. He sent a *questionnaire* which he said had been sent out to all colleges and universities, and which he thought clearly betrayed this purpose. "If this effort is persisted in," he added, "it will rip our educational system from stem to stern." I was not able to discover a particular

animus in this *questionnaire*. I could not determine whether it originated with the radicals or the conservatives. To me its significance consisted in the fact that it called for data disclosing the *tendenz* of the school and its teachers. What could be the object of collecting such information if not that of setting a watch upon the teachers?

This situation ought to convince those who have the interests of true education at heart that it is high time for a clear restatement of the proper functions of the public schools. The remedy clearly lies in the banishment of all propaganda and partisanship from education. The difficulty in the way of applying this remedy seems to be that many teachers have either never risen to scientific impartiality or have permitted themselves to be swept away by the violent currents outside the schools. One naturally thinks that those who exercise a large influence among teachers would advise them to keep clear of partisan agitation. They seem, on the contrary, to be scolding them for not being more active in current politics. Mr. F. L. Cummings, president of the Montana Teachers' Association, speaking before the assembled teachers of the state at Billings last November, exhorted them to make an effort to control politics by making themselves leaders in the discussions of political and social problems. He did not utter a single word of caution as to the danger involved in this although the state had just

emerged from an exceptionally bitter campaign in which the schools had drawn no small part of the radical fire. Some of the radical speakers had demanded of the teachers open espousal of the radical cause as the price of support for the school bonds to be voted on at the election. Now, as if to appease the radicals, Mr. Cummings made a veiled charge against the mining companies to the effect that they were not paying their just share of taxes, which led Mr. D. M. Kelley, vice president of the Anaconda Copper Mining Company, to protest that Mr. Cummings had not presented the case fairly. What was Mr. Kelley doing in such a gathering? He was there because his company, already at sword's point with the state university, distrusts the whole teaching body and is prepared to fight every attempt to use the schools in the interest of its opponents in politics. It does not require much of a prophet to predict the future of Montana schools unless greater wisdom prevails among its teachers.

It seems that the speakers at these meetings positively could not refrain from introducing incendiary topics. President E. O. Sisson of the State University spoke on "The Democratic Mind." The subject appears innocent enough and it certainly needs discussion. Unfortunately, however, the speaker merely went through the usual technique by which we now identify ourselves with the democratic-pacifist merger—no virtue outside democracy, no

internal or international peace except through the organization of the world by the democracies, etc., etc., and the schools must make the "democrats." As this is merely an echo of President Wilson's war speeches, and since Wilson is not popular in Montana, it could be easily foreseen that this challenge would not go unnoticed. The democratic party in the last campaign in Montana was controlled by the radicals whose newspapers and speakers circulated President Wilson's writings and speeches, favored the league of nations, opposed military training and all the rest of it as we find it in the usual pacifist speeches and pamphlets. President Sisson's address was, therefore, little more than a typical radical speech. In short, the teachers' association was used for propaganda with pacifism as "the unifying thesis of all social reform."

A few weeks later things began to happen. The legislature proposed a special oath of loyalty for the teachers of the state. Several newspapers attacked the university for meddling in politics, one of them declaring that it was "Soaked in Socialism." This aroused President Sisson to write an open letter in which he complained bitterly of this criticism of the university. He denied that there was any propaganda for partisan or sectarian doctrine being carried on at the university, but, on the other hand, he wanted free men as teachers who could not be intimidated by the press or in any other way. Timid

neutral teachers were of no value, he said. A teacher is also a citizen with a citizen's right of independent opinion.

All this is well enough, but the real difficulty is left untouched. A professor has a right to his private opinion, but he is not paid to teach it to his students when this opinion is concerned with partisan questions. Members of the opposing party cannot be expected to tolerate this without protest, and frankly, they ought not to tolerate it. The teachers of Montana condemned themselves by their proceedings at Billings and have no right to complain when those whose opinions and interests they attacked retaliate in the only way open to them. But the interest of the teachers is of relatively little importance here. What matters greatly is the interest of education which is being jeopardized by the meddling of the teachers in affairs with which they have no special concern as teachers, that is, in their professional capacity.

The situation in Montana illustrates the danger of propaganda even when comparatively mild and indirect. What will be the effect produced by the nation-wide effort of pacifists to introduce their highly emotional propaganda into all the different grades of the schools? They have a vast literature to draw on, a centralized national direction with unlimited funds, and lecturers without number. They will be powerfully seconded by false liberalism gen-

erally which has been at work for some time to influence the schools. As far back as August, 1912, the comparatively enlightened editor of *McClure's* wrote as follows: "It would be unfortunate if in the struggle between democracy and privilege now going on in the United States, our so-called 'seats of learning,' especially those in our older Eastern states, should be found on the conservative side. . . . The main fault to be found with our Eastern universities is probably that they distinctly lag behind public sentiment and popular ideals. Unless there is an awakening, the educational leadership will pass to other young and vigorous institutions, such as the University of Wisconsin, which are really making education a part of the life around them."

Is it then the function of the universities to echo popular sentiment? If so what a colossal waste of time and money they represent. We receive the popular sentiment as naturally as the air we breathe. Has democracy established its schools merely to have its vanity tickled? Or does it desire its succeeding generations to receive in their turn an honest statement of the truth as it is discovered and conceived in the course of time? Is democracy so weak and doubtful of its cause that it will not permit a sincere question regarding its own infallibility? It is the duty of democracy to insist that the truth be taught in its schools. If the truth happens to be undemocratic there is no reason to

blame the schools but an urgent necessity for democracy to engage in a searching self-analysis in order to make its peace with truth. To do otherwise is to invite death. For the safety of democracy lies precisely in the knowledge of its citizens and not at all in the mere adoration of its votaries.

And right here is one of the chief objections to the whole pacifist-liberal movement, the intellectual and social revolution spoken of by Dr. Nasmyth. Its appeal is almost wholly to the emotions. This is exactly what we do not want and what we must avoid if we wish to prosper. Emotion and ignorance are the twin evils of democracy from which it has suffered vastly more than from foreign autocrats. We must get over our notion that everything can be settled by a count of noses and give more attention to what is going on behind the noses we count. Our political campaigns are a disgrace to us. This is proved by the attitude of the politician who finds it more effective to juggle with our emotion complexes for data than to enter into serious discussion addressed to the intellect. No intelligent person now goes to hear a politician or popular lecturer in the hope of gaining enlightenment. He already knows that the speaker will merely string together a number of catch-phrases to please his audience. The object is not to convince through evidence but to hold in line or stampede through the emotions. All parties are guilty of the practice. The conduct

of the pacifists, however, is especially obnoxious because they have ransacked the whole human mind for incendiary material which they now habitually use in their propaganda. The honest and enlightened pacifist regrets this and understands that the objects of pacifism can never be attained by such a method, but his protests are no longer heeded.⁵

This vicious pacifism I have described as the "democratic-pacifist merger." It was this merger which controlled during the war and made the peace. For the time being it held the fate of the world in its hands. If there is no peace now nor any prospect for peace, we know where to go with our complaints. But lest there be the slightest doubt on this point let me repeat in outline the theory on which the war was fought and peace made. It will explain why there is no peace today. In the war aims of President Wilson and the allied spokesmen we find the following propositions:

1. Germany is an autocracy, therefore she is aggressive.

2. The German people are pacific and did not want war.

⁵ See, for instance, the sharp criticism of the new pacifism by the veteran editor of the *Friedens-Warte*, Dr. Alfred H. Fried. *The Restoration of Europe*, chap. V. This was published in 1916, before pacifism in America had gone to the extremes we note today. It is interesting to note his idea of a league of nations developed in chapter VI. He did not favor a political union or federation with powers of coercion such as is provided in article ten of the league covenant, but an economic "Co-operative Union" after the manner of the Pan-American Union.

3. The German government deceived the people into supporting the war.

4. The German government (Kaiser) wilfully plotted war and consciously chose the most favorable moment for declaring it.

5. The allied nations are democratic and pacific.

6. It is the duty of democratic nations to destroy autocratic governments and free their people.

7. Democratic governments cannot make war without the consent of the people.

8. Peace cannot be made with autocratic governments.

9. Every people has a right to independence and self-determination.

10. The war is being fought in defense of small nationalities.

11. The war is a war to end war.

Not one of these propositions is wholly true and most of them are wholly false.

1. The German government is not an autocracy. The Kaiser exercised less influence upon legislation than does our president. The German Empire was a parliamentary state with all the essentials of political liberty, and was entirely satisfactory to the responsible people within its boundaries.⁶ Before

⁶ During the war we heard a great deal about the tyranny of the German police. In our loose conception of everything in Europe we charged this to the "War Lord," to the military, etc. As a matter of fact the imperial authorities are not charged with police powers. That is left entirely to the separate states of which the empire is composed. The police

the creation of the empire central Europe was in constant turmoil and the cause of innumerable wars. The empire put an end to this state of affairs. The German Empire was one of the strongest guaranties of peace in Europe. Its aggressiveness did not result from its form of government but from the character of its people and their excessive birth rate leading to overcrowding.

2. The German people have been regarded as extremely warlike from the time they came into contact with civilization. The works of Tacitus, Cæsar and other Roman writers all bear testimony to this fact. They have always been aggressive and a menace to their neighbors, regardless of the form of government under which they happened to live.

powers possessed by the Emperor he exercised as king of Prussia and for Prussia alone. It is true that both in Germany and Austria-Hungary there was little local or democratic control of the police. But the popular demand just before the war was not for increased democratic control but for more centralization in the hands of the executive. The people themselves did not believe that their local governments would give them an efficient police. Their quarrel with the police was not based on their autocratic power but upon the manner in which they sometimes exercised their authority. They evinced no desire to become responsible for the exercise of this authority. See Raymond B. Fosdick, *European Police Systems*, chap. II. New York, 1916.

Another frequent criticism of the Imperial Government related to the restricted franchise. But this, too, was a matter for the separate states. The property qualifications existed only in Prussia. The overthrow of the Imperial Government would not, in itself, affect this in the least, any more than the overthrow of our own federal government would restore the franchise to the negro in our southern states.

These things are not mentioned with the intention of defending Germany, but to show that our criticism was irrelevant if not something worse.

3. The German government did not deceive its people any more than did the governments of the allies deceive their people. They did not need to be deceived to fight. If the government had not come to the support of Austria they would have severely censured it. They were dissatisfied with the government because of its conciliatory attitude in the Moroccan affair three years before.

4. The Kaiser did not plot to bring about the war. He worked almost as frantically as did Sir Edward Grey to prevent it. He was guilty of stupidity in giving Austria a free hand in its dealing with Serbia, promising his support, and perhaps also of excessive nervousness over the mobilization of Russia which preceded that of Germany. The Kaiser did not want war at this time but, on the contrary, broke out in angry denunciation of Austria and the Entente when he found that war could not be averted. The reader can find the incontrovertible evidence in support of these statements in the articles of Prof. Sydney B. Fay in the *American Historical Review* for July and October, 1920.

5. President Wilson and many of his supporters have within the last year denounced our associates in the war as autocratic and militaristic.

6. There are no consistent and universally accepted definitions of either democracy or autocracy, and such a principle, if acted on, would make war an uninterrupted condition.

7. The statement is a hypocritical evasion. The executive of every parliamentary government can so conduct affairs as to make war inevitable. As a matter of fact the legislatures always declare war upon request of the executive. When twelve senators voted against President Wilson's request for powers connected with armed neutrality in 1917 he denounced them as the "wilful twelve," thereby implying that they had no choice in the matter.

8. In that case we should now, on President Wilson's own word, be at war with all our former associates in the war.

9. Then every dependency in the world is being unjustly deprived of its rights. Ireland, India, the Philippines, Porto Rico and numerous other small nations should at once be set free, by force, if necessary.

10. But not for Greece invaded by the allies under protest. The rule applies only to our enemies!

11. If that was the object of the war then it has signally failed under pacifist leadership.

Now, I protest and have protested from the beginning, that it was not necessary for the allies and America to stultify themselves in this way. This is little better than plain lying. An unadorned truthful statement would have served our cause just as well and might have averted the disastrous aftermath. As far as America is concerned, we had a much nobler motive for entering the war than any

contained in the above propositions. We fought, in the first place, for our self-respect and to protect our rights and the lives of our people. In the second place we fought to help our friends, especially the French people who had come to our aid in one of the darkest hours of our history. Germany identified war with extermination. From purely selfish motives we could not afford to permit a fine race like the French to be wiped from the face of the earth. From the time of the earliest recorded history it has been considered a noble act for a people to go to the assistance of their friends when the latter were threatened with overwhelming disaster. The German method of warfare constituted a crime against humanity and that was sufficient justification for our interference.

Are the people who supported this program or even those who took an active part in putting it through satisfied with the results? Here is what one of them, Prof. Pauphilet, wrote a little over a year ago. "It is no longer a secret that the form which peace has taken does not satisfy all the hopes which sustained us during the war. We had hoped that, in replacing the old European empires by free nations, we should put an end to all serious discords and help to appease such minor differences as still remained. But what do we actually see today? From one end of Europe to the other, nothing but bitter quarrels, threats of war, or armed attacks.

It would seem as though men had never been so bellicose as since the war came to an end. Instead of the dynastic disputes of the old days—which, after all, produced more diplomatic than military conflicts—we have today rivalries between the peoples which are far more heated and more apt to be translated into action. Towns and provinces are still bones of contention, but the feeling on either side is more bitter than ever, and far more ready recourse is had to that odious weapon of military force which we had thought to be discredited forever. Germans, Poles, Lithuanians, Esthonians, Roumanians, Ukrainians, Czecho-Slovaks, Magyars, Serbs, Croats, Albanians, German-Austrians, and Italians are all at each other's throats, or at any rate would like to be so if they were not restrained by fear of the still effective Entente policeman. But when once the French, British, and Americans are demobilized, there will be nothing to prevent Central Europe from lapsing into a kind of pandemonium, where the nationalities will simply devour each other unchecked.”⁷

Dr. Democrat with his pacifist medicine kit has taken the place of Dr. Hapsburg and now the patient is very much worse. But Prof. Pauphilet is still hopeful. The medicine must be made stronger, he says. Let every group of people no matter how

⁷ Article from *The New Europe*, reprinted in *The Living Age*, Nov. 1, 1919.

small, be allowed to set up an independent government. That would satisfy the nationalistic aspirations of everyone, he thinks, and remove the last cause of discord. Unfortunately there are large areas in which the various nationalities are actually intermingled, and it is just these areas which are the chief cause of the conflicts. Moreover, he admits that all these nationalities are imperialistic and striving to regain the widest frontiers they possessed at any time in their history. Not content with this they also seek natural frontiers regardless of the fact that to secure them they must in some cases annex alien peoples. I think that any intelligent person not blinded by theoretical prepossessions will now admit that self-determination was not the cure for the ills of this part of the world.

But Prof. Pauphilet was an outsider. He was not a member of the peace conference, and his confession may not have cost him very much. Listen now to what General Smuts, chief author of the League of Nations covenant, had to say on January 8, 1921: "Let us admit the truth, however bitter it is to do so for those who believe in human nature. It was not Wilson who failed. The position is far more serious. It was the human spirit itself that failed at Paris. It is no use passing judgments and making scapegoats of this or that individual statesman or of a group of statesmen. Idealists make a great mistake in not facing the real facts sincerely

and resolutely. They believe in the power of the spirit, in the goodness which is at the heart of things, in the triumph which is in store for the great moral ideals of the race. But this faith only too often leads to an optimism which is sadly and fatally at variance with results. It is the realist and not the idealist who is generally justified by the events. We forget that the human spirit, the spirit of goodness and truth in the world, is still only an infant crying in the night, and that the struggle with darkness is yet mostly an unequal struggle.

“Paris proved this terrible truth once more. It was not Wilson who failed there, but humanity itself. It was not the statesmen that failed, so much as the spirit of the peoples behind them. The hope, the aspiration for a new world order of peace and right and justice—however deeply and universally felt—was still only feeble and ineffective in comparison with the dominant national passions which found their expression in the peace treaty. Even if Wilson had been one of the great demi-gods of the human race he could not have saved the peace. Knowing the peace conference as I did know it from within, I feel convinced in my own mind that not the greatest man born of woman in the history of the race would have saved that situation. The great hope was not the heralding of the coming dawn as the people thought, but only a dim imitation of some far off haven toward which we shall yet have to make many

a long weary march. Sincerely as we believed in the moral ideals for which we had fought, the temptation at Paris of a large booty to be divided proved too great. And in the end not only the leaders but the peoples preferred a bit of booty here, a strategic frontier there, a coal field or an oil well, an addition to their population or their resources—to all the faint allurements of the ideal. As I said at the time, the real peace was still to come, and it could only come from a new spirit in the peoples themselves.”

If Diogenes with his lantern were today wandering about South Africa he would take a second look at Ian Christian Smuts, but in the end, I am sure, he would shake his head and pass on. For while this confession is unmistakably honest as far as it goes, and it goes much farther than any other of the allied statesmen has so far dared to go, it is still far short of the truth. When he says that “It is the realist and not the idealist who is generally justified by the events” the cat is just about out of the bag. The curious part of it is that he does not seem to see that it is the “events” which justify the procedure, and that the idealist who makes a wrong diagnosis is justly censured for his mistake. A few pages back I quoted the main propositions of the allied spokesmen and pointed out that they formed a mixture of irrelevancies and untruths. That was their diagnosis upon which they based their remedies

which naturally failed to produce the desired effect. General Smuts implies that the allied statesmen did not live up to their high professions and did not take the measures they promised to take. He should specify in what particulars they failed so as to make clear how President Wilson was cheated of his reward. To me it seems that they came remarkably close to doing what they promised to do,⁸ and that their failure is not due to a betrayal of their principles but that they failed precisely because they were true to their principles. There was no territorial grab on their part outside the case of Shantung which does not enter very prominently into the European situation. Germany was deprived of some territory but this was done on the principle of nationality. France received back Alsace and Lorraine as was promised, and on the eastern and southern frontiers there is no sharp dividing line between Slav and Teuton. There was a good deal of quarreling over the Italian demands but it does not seem that Italy received much more than she was entitled to under the principle of national unity. President Wilson himself admitted the justice of slight departure from the rule where a natural frontier is in question. As to the division of colonial spoils they lived up fully to their word.

The failure lies in the treatment of the central

⁸ President Wilson himself, on his return to America, took the position that the peace treaty was justified by the principles proclaimed during the war.

empires, the destruction of the monarchies followed by the dismemberment of Austria-Hungary, the restoration of Poland and the creation of a number of small frontier states between Russia and Germany. The wars and threats of wars of which Prof. Pauphilet speaks all refer to these small nations or result from their establishment as independent states.

What the conference has really done in Central Europe is to give effect to the age old policy of France. Before the rise of Prussia the Hapsburg power was the chief enemy of France on the continent. For hundreds of years the efforts of France were directed toward the prevention of strong centralized states in this part of Europe. She drew as many as possible of the small semi-independent states into alliance with herself and encouraged them in their opposition to the imperial authority. When Prussia superseded Austria in South German politics and finally established a true German Empire and France suffered her crushing defeat in 1870-1871, this policy was naturally abandoned as hopeless. It remained for the democratic-pacifist merger to revive it and give it effect.

It would not seem, then, that there is much cause for surprise that the Hapsburgs failed to establish an efficient and satisfactory government over the naturally discordant elements in their empire. Now that their work, such as it was, has been completely

undone and the forces of chaos given full sway, perhaps our fervent democrats will cease talking long enough to do a little serious thinking. Then, if they have even the partial sincerity of a General Smuts, they will be fortunate if they can quiet their conscience when they look upon the misery now nearly universal among the peoples of the former Hapsburg Empire. It is more probable, however, that we shall wash our hands of the whole mess and allow these people to find a new *modus vivendi* to take the place of the one we have done all we could to destroy. It would not be "democratic" to do anything else, and if these lands are democratic it is a small matter that they are at the same time turned into a desert waste! We have saved our ideals!

On the other hand, it is foolish and unjust to blame France for this destructive policy. As things have turned out she can do nothing else unless it be to commit suicide. Her position is more precarious today than at any other time in her history as a modern centralized state. She no longer has a powerful ally on the continent and the support of England is rendered doubtful by the attitude of English labor and English pacifists. If Central and Eastern Europe should recover economically and attain some political coherence, its vast population would enable it to sweep like an avalanche over the rest of Europe. France will, therefore, continue her destructive policy with reference to her neighbors on the East.

At the peace conference she asked for a strong military league of nations. This the idealistic pacifists refused her. Then she demanded a defensive alliance with England and America. She has her alliance with England, but the debate over the league of nations has so disgusted us that it seems doubtful if the proposed alliance with France can now be put through. President Wilson could not consistently urge this treaty because to do so would have weakened his case for the league. Such an alliance would rest upon the old principle of the balance of power with which President Wilson refused to have anything to do. France has no confidence in the league of nations that was actually organized and would be foolish to rely upon our aid under its provisions were we finally to enter it, because our spokesmen for the league have repeatedly declared that it does not obligate us to military intervention in Europe. But unless France receives a categorical assurance of adequate support she will not permit the recovery of Central Europe if she can prevent it.⁹ The only

⁹ The correspondent Mark Sullivan writing from Washington on March 13, 1921, and purporting to give the opinion of the "six men who have the most recent authoritative information from Europe," said, "All agree that France's motive is not primarily money; that military occupation of Germany would cost a dollar for every dollar collected, and that the chief purpose is to reduce Germany to such impotence that France need no longer fear her." This referred to the occupation of German territory by French, English, and Belgian troops after the failure of the London reparation conference early in the month.

Before the war German writers openly urged this same

country which can give her this assurance is the United States. Therefore the first condition of a normal Europe is the ratification of the proposed treaty with France.

We cannot afford to make any more mistakes of this sort. It was the pressure of pacifism which gave us the outline of the theory upon which we fought and upon which the settlement was made. At the bottom of the whole thing lies the old hypocritical dogma that the people themselves never seek war but are always forced into it by autocratic governments. Prof. Pauphilet, General Smuts and many others who hold this dogma, have now confessed that this was an error. But that a few honest men should confess their mistake is not enough. The guilt for clinging obstinately to this blind delusion, for constantly urging it upon others, must be brought home to the great body of liberals who have identified their cause with that of pacifism. Negative evidence, however, will not convince them. It is useless to point out that there is no historical basis for the belief in the wilful perversity of autocrats and the angelic disposition of the people; to recall that the people of Roumania, Italy, and the United States demanded war long before their governments were prepared for it. The critic must suggest an alternative that could

policy for Germany with reference to France in case of a German victory in the next war.

have been taken by the pacifist allies with better results.

And this alternative was so obvious that only our foolish prepossessions prevented us from seeing it. Our conduct at the peace conference was greatly handicapped by the heavy mortgage placed against it by our spokesmen during the war. The present universal pessimism is due chiefly to the unsatisfactory conditions in Central Europe. There can be no true peace in the rest of the world until there is peace here. However much we may have detested the Hohenzollerns and Hapsburgs, they served to hold the discordant elements together and made existence possible and fairly tolerable for them. Their political destruction had about the same effect that would be produced by the removal of the spine from the body of an individual. Co-ordinated action ceased with the destruction of the monarchies. We forced the people of Central Europe to overthrow their rulers as a condition preliminary to peace and compelled them to assume responsibilities for which they were not prepared. Our professed desire to bring liberty to these people was tarnished by the secret hope that this liberty would at the same time weaken their resistance. We should have weighed the immediate benefits against the future costs which are not borne alone by the people whom we have thus betrayed. We should not have exacted the elimination of the Hohenzollerns and Hapsburgs, but in-

stead should have opened negotiations with them before the whole political structure collapsed. But such a move our pacifist spokesmen persisted in representing as leading to an inconclusive peace on the theory that no peace is possible with monarchical governments. This was a war to end all war by destroying autocracy and organizing a league of democratic nations. But the terms of peace might have been made just as drastic against the monarchies as those actually imposed upon the people, including disarmament. Their defeat would have convinced the rulers that they were being placed on their good behavior, that they were tolerated for the service they could render and would be supported by the moral influence of their late enemies only so long as they continued this service. Comparatively slight changes in the constitutions of these monarchies would have removed the grounds of our complaint. A requirement to make these changes could have been incorporated in the peace terms quite as readily as the more sweeping demand for the complete overthrow of the existing governments. This policy was at least worth trying. If it failed we should have been no worse off now than we actually are. But we threw this chance away through fear and on a theory every serious student knew to be false.

General Smuts' protest against our habit of denouncing scapegoats comes too late. He should

have spoken during the war while we were deceiving ourselves about the scapegoats among our enemies. The peace was lost at that time, not during the conference. When the conference met it was too late to make peace. We could only declare hostilities at an end.

It was pacifism as the "unifying thesis of all social reform" which furnished the supporting timbers of our peace program. The whole structure has collapsed like a house of cards because there was nothing solid upon which to rest these timbers. But the failure itself will not bring us enlightenment and wisdom. We are not taking the lesson to heart. We are, on the contrary, continuing our foolish hunt for scapegoats. We are not bringing our ideas into harmony with reality. Let any one who doubts this turn to the editorial columns of the so-called liberal press. He will find that pacifism as the "unifying thesis of all social reform" still rules supreme there.

III

DAVID STARR JORDAN—EUGENICS AND WAR

In 1907 Dr. David Starr Jordan published a little book, *The Human Harvest*, in which he tried to show that war does not, as is usually maintained, lead to the survival of the fittest, but that, on the contrary, it destroys the "best we breed." It produces reversed selection—guarantees the survival of the unfit. It could have no other result, he said, because the best men, the physically soundest, are placed in the army where many of them are killed or mutilated. Only the weak and diseased remain at home to perpetuate the race.

In *War and the Breed*, published in 1915, the same subject is treated in more detail and with a greater array of proofs. The theory was also advanced in his *War and Waste* and seems to form the core of most of his lectures in the interest of the pacifist propaganda. It has been taken up by the daily press and put forward as the final and conclusive answer to the biological militarists. It has become an accepted dogma in pacifist literature and may be found in such well-known works as *The Great Illusion* of Norman Angell and *Social Progress and the Darwinian Theory* of Dr. George Nasmyth. We are, then, concerned with a trump card.

Dr. Jordan evidently received his first suggestion from the works of the late Russian sociologist, Jacques Novicow, for on his title page he prints this sentence from the latter's works: "War has at all times produced a reversed selection." Novicow has written a good deal on Social Darwinism in an effort to combat the theory of struggle with that of co-operation. He was a man of brilliant mind, but his work is somewhat marred by a partisan spirit. While insisting that war is solely destructive, he was frank enough to admit that the warlike nations have, as a matter of fact, contributed most to the advancement of the race. I have searched in vain in the works of Messrs. Jordan, Angell, and Nasmyth for this admission, though all three cite Novicow in support of their thesis. The reason for this omission is evident, for to admit the correctness of Novicow's reading of history would throw an immense burden of proof upon their shoulders and at the same time cut them off from the only field in which conclusive proof could be found.

In the *Human Harvest* heredity, working through selection, is represented as the sole medium of race improvement. "The change in the blood which is the essence of race progress," he says, "as distinguished from progress in civilization, finds its cause in selection only." "Evil influences may kill the individual but cannot tarnish the stream of heredity. The child of each generation is free-born so far as

heredity goes, and the sins of the father are not visited upon him."

As a rule Olympian decrees are not popular. But the one here proclaimed will certainly bring a comforting assurance to those who are inclined to tread the "primrose way of dalliance." As a sceptical layman, however, I suspect that we have to do in this case not with Olympus but with August Weismann and his "continuity-of-germ-plasm" theory, and that Dr. Jordan has, as in the case of Novicow's damaging admission, forgotten to tell his readers that the specialists are not agreed on this point. Possibly Dr. Jordan has, in the above quotations, stated the Weismann theory a trifle more absolutely than its author would approve. Weismann held that the character of the germ cell remained constant through the succeeding generations except as modified by the blending of the male and female elements during the process of conception, and that the reproduction cells in the offspring developed, not as a new product from the new generation, but from unused materials left over from the original cells at conception. This, in making the reproduction cells entirely independent of the individual who served as host, made the transmission of acquired characteristics impossible. Improvement of stock could then come only through the mating of superior strains so chosen as to permit the laws of blending to work to the best advantage. Possibly there is room in the theory also for the occasional appear-

ance of certain unexplainable "variations" which, if judiciously mated, could by degrees raise the breed above the level of the parent strains or their blend as indicated by the usual rule.

But, as already stated, there is no agreement on this point nor upon the question as to whether or not acquired characteristics can be transmitted. It was necessary, however, for Dr. Jordan's thesis to assume that such characteristics cannot be transmitted and that the reproduction cell be regarded as proof against either deterioration or improvement through the vicissitudes in the life of the host, otherwise inferior cells might, through better individual conduct or the effects of environment, surpass their natural superiors. In that case the dysgenic theory of war would look much less convincing.

It must have been evident to Dr. Jordan when he wrote *The Human Harvest* that even if the germ-cell is in its genesis independent of the host, it by no means follows that the health or conduct of the latter may not affect it for good or ill. But the historical proofs he then possessed for his own thesis on the effects of war could be more effectively used if he ignored this possibility. After the outbreak of the war he came into possession of material which promised a sensation if skilfully handled. In December, 1914, Prof. Vernon Kellogg published an article in which he tried to show the destructive effects of venereal diseases upon the reproduction cells. He found that these effects were not confined to the in-

dividual but transmitted from generation to generation to the lasting injury of the race. These diseases, then, were veritable "race-poisons." Using the British *Army Medical Report* for 1910, he tried, further, to show that the armies of the world are the breeding spots for these diseases and that, therefore, the very preparations for war lead to conditions making for reversed selection. It did not matter that Professor Kellogg reached this conclusion by a gross misuse¹ of his statistics, for Dr. Jordan does not hesitate to cite poetry, editorials from daily newspapers, and isolated passages from scientific works torn from their context in which alone they have any real meaning. He accepted Kellogg's article without control just as he accepted all his other evidence provided only that it helped his case.

At the same time tempting reports arrived from

¹It was necessary for Kellogg to show that these diseases were more prevalent in the army than in the civilian population. But he possessed no statistics for civilians and admitted that it was difficult to determine the percentage of infected persons. The medical report showed that the army contained a much larger percentage of infected persons than was disclosed among the applicants for entrance into the army. So he assumed that the percentage among the applicants was about the same as that obtaining among civilians generally, a totally inadmissible assumption. For, certainly the person wishing to enter the army and knowing that infection would bar him, would not apply since it could lead only to an humiliating disclosure. Only those who were ignorant of their trouble would apply, which sufficiently accounts for the low percentage among the applicants.

The use of these statistics is also unfair in that it is not made sufficiently clear that the recruits for volunteer armies in times of peace usually come from the floating population—that is, a class naturally subject to this form of immorality quite aside from their connection with the army.

the battle front. It was said that modern high explosives completely shattered some nervous systems merely through the shock they produced. This disorganization of the nervous system through injury of brain cells was said to produce traumatic neurosis. This disease, through nerve connections, in turn affected disastrously the reproduction cells and hence rendered the victims less fit for parentage. In connection with this Dr. Jordan quotes from a private letter of Dr. Ales Hrdlicka as follows:

Such men (that is, those subjected to the conditions of the modern battlefield) will marry in many cases and create progeny. But a father with epilepsy even though of traumatic origin, or with neurasthenia, nervous instability, or other marked disorders or weakening of his nervous system, cannot be expected to give rise to normal progeny. Judging from many analogous experiences with similar cases, it seems safe to assume that all deep-seated, long-continued mental and nervous disturbances will affect unfavorably the trophic centres that control the development of the germ cells, with the result of a more or less defective mental or nervous state in the progeny of such individuals. [A paragraph farther on this same writer continues:] But it is not only the direct injuries to the brain or nervous system which comes into consideration in connection with the subject of the deleterious influences on the race of the present war. Perhaps even greater harm, both in the way of resulting defective personalities and following defective progeny, will result from the extreme and prolonged tension that must be sustained in many cases by the soldier in the trenches, for days and even weeks at a time, with a maxima of excitation, fatigue, and depression; from the infectious diseases, such as

typhoid, and from the diseases of the various important organs such as the heart, liver, kidneys, and the digestive apparatus, contracted through overstrain, exposure, or direct injuries. All such conditions will leave lasting marks on the organism. They will produce a large class of invalids, and these invalids, at best, will not be able to give the proper care to their progeny; but in many cases they will, doubtless, not be able any more to transmit to their progeny a "healthy mind and a healthy body."

So, then, there is an end of the Olympian decree upon which Dr. Jordan based his theory at the outset—the independence of the reproduction cell from the effects of individual conduct. Improvement and deterioration of the race rests quite as much, if not more, upon good conduct and observation of the laws of health as upon the preservation of naturally strong strains. In fact, the distinction between natural and acquired potentialities necessarily disappears with the admissions contained in the above quotations, for the strong strain of today may be the weak one of tomorrow and *vice versa*, barring the small minority of cells so strongly tainted with "race-poisons" as lead to extinction in the course of generations through elimination in the ordinary struggles of life. Our author now recognizes as "race-poisons" the venereal diseases, salts of lead, alcohol, traumatic neurosis, most of the leading diseases of the race—in short, nearly everything which affects health injuriously. We may, then, assume, as the medical profession is inclining more and more

to do, that a reasonably sound mind and body is the possible heritage of all but a small tainted minority, and that the fate of the race does not rest upon a few specially gifted germ cells but rather upon conduct, individual and collective. If we behave ourselves as we should, the gifted cell will arrive in due time, or, having arrived, will disappear if we misbehave. Thus both the moralist and the democrat score at one and the same time even on Dr. Jordan's own showing.

It must not be supposed, however, that our author now abandons his theory. On the contrary, wherever his material would seem to require it he reaffirms it in all its rigidity. In fact he passes back and forth between the two views without betraying any consciousness of the inconsistency. But even were we to grant the validity of his original view of heredity the militarist might still counter by saying that since the sound germ cell does not depend upon a sound body it is quite possible that the decrepit individual rejected by the recruiting officer may be the host of better cells than the able-bodied man he accepts. It is, indeed, a matter of common observation that persons with a superabundance of vigor only too often dissipate their heritage in riotous living. The "sport," or "roughneck," the young man out sowing his "wild oats," and very often the alcoholic, come not from the ungifted sluggard class but from those whose energies cannot find expression

in the conventional grooves of society. Nor does the race seem to be in any danger of a famine in variations of useful potentialities. Such variations are arriving in great multitudes, afoot, ahorse, and—shall we say?—by aeroplane. With the growing complexity of life following upon a greater knowledge and use of the environment, these variations are growing so rapidly in number that the real danger seems to be the swamping of the whole conventional machinery through which they must somehow be made to pass. Our social adjustments are falling behind the demands made by the capacities for varied reaction in the race. In a word, the trouble is not with man as an animal, as Dr. Jordan holds, but with man as a member of society. The real difficulty is to so direct the individual powers as to make them serve society without at the same time killing them outright or by slow strangulation in the form of laws or social conventions.²

²Mr. W. Trotter has written a very suggestive work (*Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War*) dealing very largely with this very question of society's relation with and attitude toward the flood of variations released by co-operative adjustment to external environment. Trotter is a socialist and pacifist in disguise and this fact the reader must take into consideration. His work is speculative and wisely avoids definite judgments as far as possible. A more reliable discussion of this problem will be found in Giddings, *Principles of Sociology*, 326 ff., in which it is made clear that we have more raw material than we can take care of, and that elimination takes place both at the lower and the upper end of society—the genius as well as the degenerate suffer from this “social” or secondary selection, which we discuss a little more in detail, below.

When Dr. Jordan wishes to show that the English have deteriorated through losses in war, he points to the memorial tablets raised to commemorate the death of members of her most prominent families in foreign wars and to the long list of Oxford and Cambridge men lost in war. But when someone suggested that Tommy Atkins came rather from the lower ranks of society, he replied that the "best is not to be measured wholly from the standpoint of society or inherited wealth," and that "Tommy may have good stuff in him, as good it may be as the average lord." The reader may take his choice, but in either case I cannot see that war has killed the best in view of this statement of fact.

Dr. Jordan denies that there are compensations for the losses of war. Arnold Bennett had argued that the loss of men would leave a preponderance of women and thus lead to a better choice of wives by the remaining males. That seems in entire accord with Dr. Jordan's theory of selection, so, to be able to reply, he shifts his ground once more to the theory of race improvement through social means. He answers Bennett by saying that the preponderance of women will lead to legalized polygamy, increased numbers of illegitimate children, and drudgery and danger to the women who cannot find husbands. So anxious was he to turn everything to account that in a footnote on page 161 he cites with approval some remarks of Havelock Ellis to the effect that

while war had produced reversed selection among the men of Spain the women had not been affected. That is to say, degeneration may go on among males to any extent without a parallel degeneration among the women. The father has no share in the heredity of his daughter!

It should be pointed out that the effects of war upon the civil population are sometimes such as to more than offset the loss of able-bodied men, not in total population but in average excellence. It has been shown statistically by impartial investigators that war increases the death rate and decreases the birth and marriage rates.³ The weaker, those most easily depressed, naturally die first upon the added strain. The optimistic, that is the more desirable strain, both marry and have offspring. The pessimistic, the less venturesome, refrain and their strain tends to die out. Moreover, war checks luxuries which annually ruin and kill multitudes. The consumption of alcohol, one of the race poisons recognized by Dr. Jordan, has been nearly done away with for the time being in Europe. Russia claims

³ See F. H. Giddings, *Principles of Sociology*, pp. 367-368. The cause here assigned for the phenomenon is economic. The psychic cause is too evident to require proof which has, moreover, been supplied from the battle front since the present war began, so far as the discussion has to do with the birth and marriage rates. It may be objected that the timid and unenterprising will marry and have progeny after the war and that is no doubt true. But every delay in marriage reduces the number of offspring, since it has been shown that the early marriages are the more prolific.

that she is today better off both in men and wealth with war and no vodka than she was before without war and with vodka. This is no doubt an exaggeration, but there is a large element of truth in the boast, and if vodka is not restored after the war (and it is not the intention to restore it), the ultimate gain will greatly outweigh the losses. Hundreds of thousands of human vegetables have been uprooted and made over into human beings for the rest of their lives. To the men who have taken a large part in this war few things will appear impossible hereafter. We may expect them to count in the world's work as they would not otherwise have counted. Invention has been greatly stimulated, as is shown in the revolutionizing of air navigation, while the medical profession has learned many things which will in the future do much to compensate for the loss of life. If the Entente wins, the depressing hand of the Turk will be removed from Europe and Asia Minor and a tremendous stimulus given to Russia as a result of her free entrance to the Mediterranean. If the Central Powers are victorious, the crowded condition of Germany will be relieved, order brought to the Balkans, and Asia Minor opened to the splendid energy and efficiency of the German people.

We come now to the historical proofs which Dr. Jordan has advanced in support of his thesis. I shall confine myself to the cases of Rome, Greece,

and France. For his discussion of Rome and Greece, Dr. Jordan relies mainly upon a work of Professor Otto Seeck, *Der Untergang der Antiken Welt*. In these countries, Seeck argues, the best blood was destroyed during the frequent struggles between political parties. Civil war was followed by proscriptions which struck down the leaders and prominent men of the vanquished party. As victory passed from side to side the best men were gradually destroyed. "Whoever was bold enough to rise politically in Rome was almost without exception thrown to the ground. Only cowards remained, and from their blood came forward the new generations." Nevertheless, "In valor, discipline, and science the Roman armies remained what they had always been. . . . But the problem was how to replenish those armies. Men were wanting. The Empire perished for want of men." There were people enough, but the Roman *Vir* had given way to *Homo*. "Men of good stock were replaced by sons of slaves and camp followers, the riff-raff of those the army sucked in but could not use," says Dr. Jordan.

Let us remark here that there is no ground for the assumption that the slaves were of inferior blood. They were largely composed of the prisoners taken in war from which the weaklings had been excluded as not worth taking. Since the slaves were excluded from the army and hence not subject to reversed selection, according to the Jordan theory, they

should have improved from generation to generation. We should observe also that Seeck does not ascribe the "rooting out of the best" to war but to the prescriptions following the wars. Moreover, Jordan has, in this case as in that of Novicow, carefully neglected to give us the whole argument and conclusion.

Seeck expressly denies that Rome's wars caused her ruin. He did not regard the killing in battle as the cause of race degeneration. He found part of the mischief in the volunteer army of long service which practically excluded the possibility of marriage. The remedy he suggested was not disarmament but universal military service.

As a matter of fact there is little history in this presentation if we may believe in the conclusions of impartial specialists—that is, scholars who have no preconceived theory to vindicate. In a scholarly and detailed work ⁴ Professor Dill of Belfast has set forth the causes of the decline of the Empire. Especially clear and convincing is his explanation of the destruction of the middle class. It was from this class that the army was mainly recruited. The senatorial class, largely composed of great landholders, were excluded from the army by law, as were also the servile class except under extreme necessity. It was not war that destroyed the middle

⁴Dill, Samuel. *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*. Second Edition. London, 1906.

class or small landholders; but the crushing burden of taxation on the one hand and slave labor on the other. The great landholders worked their estates mainly by slaves which, added to the privileges and exemptions their power enabled them to extort, gradually forced the small landholders to the wall, compelling them either to join the retainers of their rivals, enter the crowd of state-fed rabble, or turn to brigandage. They were not degenerate since, as Seeck admits, they fought as well as ever, but the causes we have mentioned so reduced their number that the army could no longer be supplied from their ranks and recourse was had to outside barbarians, largely Germans who came finally to hold most of the higher commands. The evil was aggravated by the contempt into which military service had fallen after nearly the whole of the cultured population had been excluded. To make matters still worse the civilians were forbidden to carry arms and thus lost the training in the use of them so that it was necessary to teach the recruit the use of the sword along with the rest of the army discipline. As desertions threatened to disrupt the army the recruits were branded as if they were "slaves of the *ergastulum*," says Dill. In the time of Marius, when the army was thrown open to the rabble, there was no effective opposition to recruiting from this class. Now, however, many non-property-holding persons had become permanently attached to the estates of the

great landholders who, out of personal interest, opposed their entrance to the army and the government was finally compelled to yield their demand to pay in money rather than in recruits.

Such is, in outline, the explanation of the scarcity of recruits. We need not depend on theory because the facts are plainly written in the imperial edicts of the time. It is more than probable that under a system less rigid and cumbersome than the Roman under the Empire an abundance of able-bodied men could have been secured. But if, for the sake of argument, we admit that this was not the case, that the men of the Empire had degenerated, we could not possibly ascribe the fact to the rooting out of the best through war. The Empire contained something like one hundred million inhabitants who, at the time of the Germanic invasions, had lived for three hundred years in the profoundest peace the Western world had ever known. The Roman Peace had put an end to the chronic state of war existing among the hundreds of tribes inhabiting the lands of the empire. This hundred million inhabitants furnished a standing army of 150,000 legionaries with a certain quota of auxiliaries increased or diminished as circumstances required. These soldiers did infinitely less fighting than the German tribes they were unable to check at the frontiers. All contemporary evidence emphasizes the warlike character of the Germans. They fought almost con-

stantly among themselves or with other tribes to the east of them as well as with the Romans. If war were so potent a factor in race degeneration they should have been immeasurably more degenerate than the Romans they overthrew. Moreover, how shall we explain the high quality of Roman manhood during the republican period when all her great conquests were made? The Romans worked their way upward through the same state of chronic war we have observed among the Germans and elsewhere. It was the lot of every race in primitive times to sleep on its weapons, and he who could not defend himself at a moment's notice had only a choice between death or slavery. Where, then, did Rome obtain her splendid soldiers of the Punic wars? Dr. Jordan ascribes the fall of Carthage to the same race degeneration through war. But Carthage rarely sent her citizens to war. She hired mercenaries to do her fighting and took the field with her own citizens only when these failed her. And yet Rome, which at this time recruited her armies only from the property classes, completely destroyed her. In fact, historians usually discover the military weakness of Carthage in her mercenary army.

And what shall we say to the charge of degenerate manhood brought against the Greeks? Greece lost her independence at the battle of Chæroneia in 338 B. C. Professor Oman, whose specialty is Greek history, writes of this battle:

"So ended this well-fought battle, for which Greece had no cause to blame her soldiers, but she might well ask herself in shame why Athens, Thebes, and Corinth were left almost alone to fight the battle of Hellenic liberty. Elis and Argos, Arcadia and Messene, were standing apart in selfish prudence; Thessaly sent her horsemen to help the Macedonian stranger. Once more the narrow spirit of local ambition had proved the evil genius of Greece."

Every student of Greek history knows that the great orator Demosthenes had for years tried to arouse his countrymen to the danger from Philip of Macedon. His "Philippics" are our present-day models of Greek oratory. In his insistence and vehemence he may be compared to our own Roosevelt. It was not a degenerate manhood but the sluggish indifference, combined with local jealousies, which caused the political downfall of Greece. The Greek soldiers at this time were the best in the world and there was a great superfluity of them. In spite of the incessant wars between the Greek cities, the surplus of fighting men was so large that Greek mercenaries swarmed in all the civilized non-Hellenic states of the Mediterranean. Xenophon has left us an account of the "Ten Thousand" who took part in the war of Cyrus to dethrone his brother. We find traces of them even in far-away Egypt. They faced Alexander on the Granicus and at Issus, and the Romans when at war with Carthage. More than sixty years after Chæroneia a military adventurer,

Pyrrhus, gathered an army of them and twice defeated the Romans in their best fighting days, and for several years held at bay the combined might of Rome and Carthage—Carthage which was not degenerate because she did not send out the best of the breed.

Finally, what of “degenerate” France? Is she really in need of defence today? Even before *War and the Breed* went to press she had given a crushing answer to this particular slander. Nevertheless we shall deal with the evidence as presented by Dr. Jordan and others. The Napoleonic wars, especially, we are told, destroyed the French physique so that the average stature of Frenchmen declined an inch or two. So disastrous has the reversal of selection proved that, according to Angell, even three-foot dwarfs are now drafted into the army.

But here, as is only too often the case with pacifist statistics, the figures given prove nothing to the point in question. English scholars, among them Sir Ronald Ross, editor of *Science Progress*, Mr. Chalmers Mitchell, and Professors Karl Pearson and J. A. Thomson,⁵ have dealt with Dr. Jordan’s theory

⁵I am depending here upon the analysis of this literature by Mr. Coulton in *The Main Illusions of Pacifism*, Chap. VIII, the works themselves not being accessible to me. While this work is frankly polemical in nature, it is at the same time thoroughly conscientious and exact in the statement of facts. It is a merciless piece of criticism, having to do largely with Norman Angell’s *Great Illusion* and other pacifist works of this writer. He differs from the works he attacks in that he cites his authorities honestly and exactly. It is an excellent work of its kind and I gladly acknowledge my indebtedness to it in the preparation of this article.

and declared that there is little evidence to support it. The case against France rests upon the fact that requirements as to stature were several times reduced in successive calls for recruits. But this, to my mind, proves nothing except that the taller men were taken at the first recruitings and that at succeeding ones men of shorter stature were also taken. It proves nothing whatever regarding the average stature of Frenchmen before and after the Napoleonic wars. Recruiting officers have always had a preference for tall men. This preference they could gratify at a time when comparatively small armies of volunteers did all the fighting, as was the case before the revolutionary wars of France. Naturally the average stature of the pre-Napoleonic soldier was above that of an army comprising nearly the whole of the able-bodied men of the nation. The standing army of France before the revolution numbered about 200,000 drawn from a population of nearly 25,000,000. That is to say, before 1789 there was one soldier to 125 of the population. To-day there is one to every seven or eight. The recruiting officer of today must, therefore, find sixteen recruits where his predecessor was required to produce but one.

Dr. Jordan reproduces the argument we have here criticised from the article of Professor Vernon Kellogg already cited. This article was prepared for the Carnegie Peace Foundation and no doubt widely

circulated through its agency. And yet our author uses up considerable rhetoric in an effort to convince the reader that pacifism is a crusade in the interest of truth and that the pacifists must be classed with the great martyrs of the race!

The chief weakness of the dysgenic theory of war lies in the failure to take account of the enormous change which has taken place in the struggle for survival following the appearance of conscious co-operation. For survival in the human species has long ceased to rest mainly upon animal qualities. Natural selection still plays its part but it is overshadowed in importance and controlled by factors of a social and psychic nature. Man, because of his great mental capacity, reacts to his environment in a multitude of different ways and thereby produces an infinity of variations which effectually guard against race deterioration. Among lower animals heredity is a dominant factor because conduct is instinctively confined, or nearly so, to the narrow channel of subsistence and reproduction. Conduct being so nearly identical, variation must depend almost solely upon heredity since external environment remains just about constant. Not so with man. His conduct is indefinitely varied and he transforms his environment almost at will. Thus the animal side of his being now waits upon the mind which, through its wide choice of conduct, determines the health and

vigor of the body to a much larger degree than is the case among the lower animals.

It is evident that as the moral code advances natural selection in the original sense must recede. The struggle for survival continues—is, perhaps, even intensified—but its character is changed. Co-operative adjustment to external environment having taken the place of individual adjustment, new individual qualities, in conformity with the new order, must take the place of the old. Inside the social group—city, state, nation, etc.—the individual has been enabled to develop his powers to an extent inconceivable among lower animals, because the menace of destruction from without is infinitely more remote. His potentialities have, therefore, enormously increased through freedom of action formerly prevented at every turn by immediate necessity. But this freedom from the tyranny of the natural environment was made possible only by the self-imposed restraint in the form of the social conventions—that is, the moral code, public opinion, laws, etc. For that reason a secondary or social selection has largely taken the place of the former natural selection. Society now creates the environment and prescribes the rules governing the process of elimination and in that way determines who are fit or unfit. The task of this social selection, so far as it is directly creative of race improvement either

through institutions or individual powers, has become chiefly that of assimilating the flood of variations which has followed the removal of the menace from the external environment, and survival is now conditioned, in the first instance, by society. The welfare of the individual is still the ultimate aim, but it is seen that this welfare is, in the long run, dependent upon society. If social selection is too rigid, as socialism would make it, the variations will decrease in number and by degrees individual potentialities will be lowered. If it is too lax there will be a tendency for society to break down and for natural selection to become effective again.⁶

I have indulged in this excursion into social dynamics in order to explain an obvious fact, namely, that heredity does not hold the dominant position in the human species that it does among the lower animals and that the very statement of Jordan's thesis therefore constitutes an exaggeration. Possibly the immediate compensations of war do not balance the losses, though this is not proved. The militarist can grant that much and yet not surrender his case, for history proves that the ravages of the most destructive wars are usually made good in a comparatively short time. The real test of the value of war lies in the potentialities of the situation created

⁶ See W. Trotter, *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War*. Also Giddings, *Principles of Sociology*, Book III, Chap. 4, "Demogenic Association."

by it. Does it bring about readjustments necessary to give freer play to the creative forces of the race? Historians and sociologists have usually answered in the affirmative.⁷

We may take for illustration one of Dr. Jordan's "horrible examples," Rome. Did Rome's wars advance or retard civilization? That is the test of the value. The moment we ask that question the Jordan proposition becomes an absurdity. Western civilization today rests upon a Roman basis. Rome is today the "greatest single fact in history" no matter what has become of the Romans. We find it difficult to print a sentence, try a case at law, or even worship God without betraying the fact that she survives in our very marrow. The touchstone of our political faith, "all men are by nature free and equal," is taken bodily from the Roman law, itself the outgrowth of her conquests. Many of the legal codes of Europe are little more than an adaptation of the Roman law and the principles of international law found their first effective application in the Roman Empire. It was under the protection of the Roman sword that the superior civilization of the Mediterranean basin was carried to the dwellers of the great northern plains of the continent. The Christian church, modelled upon the Roman state

⁷I need not prove this attitude of the scientists since Dr. Nasmyth admits it and has taken much pains to make clear what he calls their pessimistic teaching. *Social Progress and the Darwinian Theory*. See especially Chap. II.

and using the Latin language spread for her convenience throughout the Empire, found her work of conversion advanced whole centuries as a direct result of the Roman conquests. The persecutions over, the Roman law and Roman sword were everywhere the powerful aids of the Christian missionary. Speaking of the Augustan age Professor George Burton Adams says:

One of the new buildings was the Pantheon, in which were gathered all the gods of the Empire, something new in the world, but symbol of a still more important thing that was new—the community of nations in a common system. This community of nations once established by Rome has never ceased, though it has changed its form, and out of it grew the idea of the unity of all men—the brotherhood of man, as they began to call it in the early days of the Empire. This idea, of such immense value in the civilization of the world, and soon to be so strongly reinforced by the teachings of Christianity, first rose to consciousness in the minds of men as a result of the conquests and organized Empire of Rome.

The work of the Empire was well and thoroughly done. So potent was its spell that long after it had ceased to exist people refused to believe in its demise. The very men who overthrew it gloried in the name of “Roman” and loaded themselves with the external trappings of the Empire. In the East it continued in unbroken line until finally overthrown by the Turks in 1453. Charlemagne re-established the Empire of the West in 800 and Otto I of Germany as-

sumed the title of Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire in 961. It did not finally perish in name until 1806 at the hands of Napoleon. During the whole of the Middle Ages it was the one idea, aside from Christianity, which prevented the total political disintegration of Europe, and the Roman law was one of the chief instruments through which the absolute monarchy finally restored order out of the feudal chaos.

But all the good which, according to Messrs. Angell, Jordan, and others, came from the Roman conquests, was the degeneration and destruction of the Roman people. A view so childishly crude, it is safe to say, would not be tolerated in an undergraduate of any respectable college or university. And yet it has been hailed by the press and by some men who call themselves scientists, as a scientific discovery of great importance, while its authors, both here and in England, travel up and down the land to explain their doctrine to wide-eyed and open mouthed ⁸ audiences. They are regarded as men of genius who have put the dull and plodding students who have some respect for their sciences and the responsibilities which rest upon them, in the wrong. So from pacifist quarters now comes the cry that

⁸ Should the reader feel that these adjectives are too strong I would refer him to *The Main Illusions of Pacifism* by G. G. Coulton, Chap. I, and his descriptions of the Norman Angell and other peace societies of England. Mr. Coulton speaks from personal experience and in detail.

history must be rewritten; that there is too much war in it. Henceforth we must have history as we find it, let us say, in *War and the Breed*.

And, after all, the Romans have not perished. More people essentially of Roman blood exist today than at any other time in history. Nor are they degenerate. The proud Teuton recognizes them as superior to himself in native wit.⁹ They are once more a great nation in their own *Italia* and again fighting the old barbarian enemy of the north. The great Catholic Church, with more communicants than any other Christian sect, is still essentially Roman in spirit, is directed from Rome and uses the Roman language. During the Middle Ages they taught Europe many things in the way of commerce and city government and gave the world the great Renaissance. But even if they had perished it would not have mattered greatly from a world point of view, provided they succeeded in doing their work. It is better for a nation to be warlike and accomplish something for human progress than be peaceful and do nothing. That is the historical point of view to which we must hold our theorist. Would the world have been better off today if the Roman had confined his sway to his "Seven Hills" on the Tiber? I know of no recognized authority on Roman history who does not expressly or by implication answer in the

⁹ See the careful and analytical statement on this point in *Grundriss zum Studium der Politischen Oekonomie*, by Prof. Dr. J. Konrad, Jena, 1900. Vol. 1, 32-35.

negative. And the historian's answer is not essentially different with regard to Greece, France, England, and Germany.

These works of Dr. Jordan bring little useful information to the student. If there is a grain of truth in the theory they contain his real task was to isolate it so as to bring it into clear relief in order to determine its value in relation to the other factors involved in the larger problem. Had he followed this procedure he would have shown himself a true scientist. Instead he chose the rôle of the propagandist whose mission is to distort. To the scholar also there is only one unpardonable sin—infidelity to truth. Feeling that he has committed this sin the author naïvely seeks to disarm criticism by admitting exaggeration for the sake of effect. As the subject is essentially of a statistical nature this condemns the conclusion as nearly worthless. Having thus led his readers into the wilderness he leaves them there without chart or compass. For his method is as false as his conclusion. He covers up his tracks by citing his authorities in such a loose way as to make control all but impossible in most cases. His translations from foreign languages are often inaccurate. Sometimes this inaccuracy amounts to positive distortion. The key-sentence from Novicow printed on the title page of *The Human Harvest* is, "La guerre a produit de tout temps une selection à rebours." (War has at all times produced a re-

versed selection.) In Dr. Jordan's hands this becomes, "In all times war must reverse the process of selection," thus changing a judgment upon the past into a prophecy as to the future.¹⁰

On page 98 of *War and the Breed* we have one of the few exact citations, except for the page, to the source from which three sentences are taken and translated, namely, a biography of Ulrich von Hutten, by David F. Strauss. The first two sentences are from a letter of Luther to Spalatin, and are translated correctly as follows: "Yesterday I heard and read Franz von Sickingen's true and sorrowful story. God is a righteous and marvelous judge." Then follows a sentence from the biographer Strauss, Sickingen's death is a verdict of God that strengthens the belief that force of arms must be held far from matters of the Gospel." Not only is the translation faulty and misleading in this sentence, but Dr. Jordan ascribes the words to Luther. If the sentence is by Luther then the judgment it

¹⁰ This is not a mere quibble. Most wars of the past have been fought between armies composed of the strong and adventurous few so that there was something in the nature of the "weeding out of the best." So far as this supports the dysgenic theory the trouble must be ascribed to the volunteer system. Today war is waged by practically the whole able-bodied male population and the effect is necessarily different because the weaker members of these immense armies are, on the whole, the first to succumb, leaving the relatively strong to perpetuate the race. It is for this reason that Seeck favoured universal military service which Jordan condemns, though he was careful not to mention the fact that his chief authority held this view.

contains must be referred to Sickingen as the original clearly shows. As reprinted by Jordan the original reads: "Sickingen's Unfall war ihm ein Gottesurtheil das ihn in der Ueberzeugung bestärkte, dass Waffengewalt von der Sache des Evangeliums ferne zu halten sei." (Sickingen's misfortune appeared to him a judgment of God which confirmed him in the conviction that force of arms must be kept distinct from the interests of the Gospel.) The correct translation would have made it clear that the sentence either could not have been by Luther or else that the pronoun *ihm* referred to Sickingen, and that the judgment on war and the Gospel was not Luther's but Sickingen's. Hence the mistranslation, unless we are to assume gross carelessness. Here again the reader is led to the door of a wrong conclusion, namely, that Luther believed war to be un-Christian. Luther was ordinarily a man of peace and did not think the interests of the Gospel could be directly furthered by war. But in political issues he did not oppose war as un-Christian. One of the most furious incitements to war ever written was his address to the German princes in 1525 to crush the peasant uprising.

One or two blunders of this kind do not necessarily condemn a whole book. But the *Human Harvest* and *War and the Breed* are full of them from beginning to end so that Mr. G. G. Coulton of Cambridge, England, who has carefully examined them on this

point, writes: "His professed translations from the German are extremely inaccurate. I have never had the misfortune to come across any book, written by a professed scientist, which treats its alleged authorities with such hopeless neglect of all scientific method." And again, "Such books as this bring science into contempt, without even helping the cause of real peace."

To sum up, these books of Dr. Jordan were not intended to inform the reader, but expressly designed to mislead him. They are propagandist literature of a very low grade. On that point there cannot be the slightest doubt. The author proves it by his one-sided and absolute statement of the disputed principles of heredity; by his shifting, without warning, from one school of biologists to the opposite school; by his chronic misuse of the authorities cited in support of his thesis; and by his systematic blinking of inconvenient facts. His misinterpretation of Seeck may have been unintentional in the *Human Harvest*. The repetition of the offence in *War and the Breed* is without the shadow of an excuse. For, when he made an address on "Eugenics and War" at Cambridge, England, in 1913, Mr. Coulton, in the discussion following the address, confronted him with Seeck's actual work and permitted him to see how flagrantly he had misrepresented him. Dr. Jordan was too shocked and confused to make any comment whatever. *War and the Breed* was published

nearly two years after this incident and in it Seeck's work is used more extensively than in the *Human Harvest* to bolster up a position which he definitely and forcibly repudiates.

As things stand at present historians and sociologists are practically unanimous in their findings against the Jordan thesis. Still, a careful investigation into the subject of *Eugenics and War* might produce useful results. But no one who is not a scholar in spirit and equipment should undertake it.

IV

THE PRINCE OF PEACE

Immediately after his resignation as Secretary of State last June, Mr. William Jennings Bryan announced that he would henceforth be a follower of the "Prince of Peace." Since that time he has, in fact, become the leader of a small but active propaganda which advocates absolute non-resistance as the only truly Christian attitude. But it must be apparent to everyone that this propaganda does not rest upon an accepted fact. It is nearly eighteen hundred years since Calvary, and as an English scholar observes, "there is nothing but war." If Mr. Bryan and his followers are right, the fifty and more generations that have come and gone since that fateful day at Jerusalem have either been ignorant of a cardinal point in the Saviour's teachings, or what is worse, have wilfully disregarded it. What evidence is there in the four Gospels of the New Testament to decide between this handful of propagandists and the Christian world as it is and has been?

To begin with, it must be conceded that a vague, nebulous tradition has long existed that Christ came

to proclaim "peace" on earth. Every Christmas season we hear anew the beautiful words from Luke: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men." To the person who accepts this language literally and as an announcement actually made by an angel chorus direct from heaven, no answer is possible except the suggestion that the word "peace" as here used, certainly has no reference to the peace of nations. "Peace to you," "Peace go with you!" "May you have peace!" were the common forms of greeting and farewell among the Jews of that day. There was no thought of war in the minds of those who used the word in this way. It conveyed the good wishes of the speaker and we should very naturally expect to find it in the "Annunciation," or greeting from heaven. All through the New Testament it is clearly used in this sense. And, as we shall see presently, this expresses exactly the essential point in the Saviour's mission.

But it is probably no longer necessary to assume that so literal a view is still held by many intelligent students of the Bible:

When we read in the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, says Warschauer, in reference to the angelic annunciation of the Saviour's birth, the angel song that greeted the Nativity, the Voice from heaven and the descent of the dove at His baptism, "that we are free to admit that they are such as were not unlikely to be added to the Gospel tradition by the disciples and the

first Christian community"—we can see what an immense change has accomplished itself in the attitude in which the Gospels are nowadays approached by reverent and competent students.

In other words, the story of the "Annunciation" is symbolical, not historical, and as such, at once loses its authoritative character. Scientific students of the New Testament are practically a unit in accepting Mark as the historical gospel and it does not contain a word on the annunciation and miraculous birth. The writers of the four Gospels looked at the teachings of Christ from different points of view. The author of Mark sought little beyond a plain statement of the more important things said and done by Christ. Matthew allowed himself somewhat more latitude. He was more interpretative, and, as his special mission was concerned with the Jews, he not infrequently supplemented the sayings of Christ with passages from the old Jewish sacred books some of which are now incorporated in the Old Testament. There was nothing reprehensible in this proceeding, for none of the Gospel writers pretended to repeat literally everything the Master had said during all the years of His ministry. That would have filled many large volumes. They tried to make His teachings clear to their contemporaries, which was exactly the task that had been imposed upon them. Consequently all careful students have long insisted that we cannot always accept the text

literally; that we must give careful attention to the context and to the writer's object and point of view, in order not to miss the real point and perhaps arrive at entirely erroneous conclusions. The sincere Christian must keep this fact constantly in mind and not be misled by glib quotations of isolated texts, for the devil, no less than the saint, can quote scripture. There is a great, central truth lying at the root of Christianity and our first task is to find it. Having found it, we can work outward again and orient ourselves in the practical affairs of daily life. This is the quest for "salvation," the seeking of the "Kingdom." But it cannot be found by parrot-like repetition of texts or phrases. Against this practice of the literalist Christ Himself has sounded the sharpest warning, as I shall make plain at the very close of this article. The truth alone can make us whole but it is not by a lazy, slovenly process that we attain it. For the majority of us, at least, it means the hardest kind of study and introspection. To get the thought out of the New Testament we must use exactly the same method used in reading other books.

The protagonists of non-resistance find one of their chief supports in the oft-quoted passages from "the Sermon on the Mount." "But I say unto you that ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also." "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, and

pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you." "And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also," and many other verses of similar tenor. (Matthew v.)

Shall we accept these texts literally and try to realize them under all circumstances? If so, what shall we do with these passages from the same Gospel? "Think not that I come to send peace on earth. I come not to send peace but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father (a very grave offense among the Jews), and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household." (Matthew x.)

As they stand these two groups of sayings are absolutely irreconcilable. The literalist cannot use them at all. As a matter of fact, construed in the light of common sense, they are not contradictory, and neither the one nor the other can, with justice to the context, be referred to the question of war. Both groups were addressed to the individual, as such, whereas war is an affair of the state. In a world which is necessarily selfish and overmuch given to wrangling as a result of mere bad temper, exhortations to be on guard against a grasping and vindictive spirit could certainly not come amiss. A spirit of give and take is a great help even to those whose genuine interests conflict. But that does not

imply indifference to righteousness and truth. In the second group the Christian's duty to contend for these is sternly insisted on, be the cost what it may. At the close of His ministry Christ came to see that His teachings would actually lead to war, although that does not seem to be implied here. Here we have simply the recognition of the fact that His message will be opposed, misunderstood, or variously interpreted, and that as a result, quarrels and violent antagonisms will ensue. Life itself was not so important as the manner in which it was lived, for "he that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." (Matthew x.) From this statement it is not far to the conclusion that a Christian should fight for his creed. In a literal age, when faith had become mixed with superstition, as during the Middle Ages, this was understood to mean that it was the Christian's duty to make war on the infidel. The idea lies at the root of the Crusades and the religious wars following the Reformation.

Another passage often quoted is Matthew xxvi:52. "Put up again thy sword into its place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." If we had only Matthew this might be regarded as conclusive from the literalist's point of view. But as it is, the question arises as to whether or not we have to do here with a genuine saying of Christ. There is, in the first place, the suspicious circum-

stance that the second, the essential part of the passage, does not occur in the other Gospels. In the second place, it is, in fact, a quotation from Genesis, and as we have already said, Matthew often inserts portions of the books of the Old Testament. Indeed, Christ could not consistently have uttered the words ascribed to him. They are said to have been spoken at Gethsemane when the officers of the council came with a multitude of the rabble at their heels to arrest Him. According to John it was Peter who then drew his sword and struck off the ear of a servant of the chief priest.

But is it not rather surprising that if Christ believed in absolute non-resistance, one of His most prominent disciples should carry a sword at all? In truth, so far was Peter from disobeying the spirit of the Master's teaching that he had taken the sword at His express command. In Luke xxii we read: "Then said he unto them, 'But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one.' . . . And they said, 'Lord, behold, here are two swords.' And he said unto them, 'It is enough.' Immediately after this they went to Gethsemane."

When Christ, therefore, rebuked Peter for drawing his sword, He did so because this was not the purpose for which the swords had been procured. To oppose the officers of the law was to invite mas-

sacre. Two swords would not have been "enough" for such a purpose. Evidently Christ wanted these swords merely as a defence against a possible attempt at assassination, for that had been more than once plotted. It is significant that Peter was one of the three chosen to go with Him apart from the rest while He sought the answer to the problem then urgently calling for solution—flight or the cross. He could not, then, have delivered the categorical denunciation of the sword ascribed to Him by Matthew. Christ did tell Peter to put up his sword, and that is all. The rest from Genesis was added by Matthew as a scolding to the Jews who had taken up the sword till Rome had laid Jerusalem, temple and all, in ashes.

If Christ was, indeed, the Prince of Peace in the sense given the appellation by the pacifists, is it not strange that He nowhere makes a genuine denunciation of war? He lived in a generation immediately following the greatest wars the Mediterranean world had seen for many a day. Cæsar and Pompey had set the Roman world afire with their quarrel. Then came the conflict between Augustus and Anthony. Judæa had fallen under the Roman sword. The land of the "Chosen People," torn by civil war, was smarting under the galling yoke of the disciples of Mars, and yet not one, real, heartfelt anathema—no, not even a single direct indication that he regarded war as a crime. The most

that we may affirm is that He looked upon war as a cause of sorrow and affliction, unaccompanied by any indication of a moral judgment. On the contrary, wars seemed to Him inevitable. When He had called down upon Himself the vengeance of the local government by His actions and preaching in the temple at Jerusalem, He saw that the end was near. It was then that He spoke to his disciples forecasting the afflictions soon to overtake them. "And when ye shall hear of wars and of rumours of wars, be ye not troubled: *for these things needs must be*; but the end shall not be yet. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom." Then, as if fearing that His disciples would take part in the coming struggle, He warned them that the "Gospel must first be published among all nations." (Mark xiii.)

It is clear from this and from the passages already quoted from Matthew, that Christ believed that great upheavals would follow as a result of his teachings. But there is no indication that He hesitated on this account to set forth the truth. If war followed, then war it must be. Moral cowardice was not in His creed. The man who believed in Him was not to submit tamely to annihilation. He must defend the right, the truth, even with the sword, if necessary. We have just seen that He armed His disciples to meet a possible attempt at assassination. We know that He laid the lash across the backs

of the money changers and others in the temple, and scattered their paraphernalia about on the ground. Words seemed inadequate to Him in a "den of thieves." There were situations in which a good, honest blow was more efficacious than moral suasion. The Saviour was not the effeminate Being some people appear to believe. He had, as one New Testament scholar remarks, "an Oriental store of wrath." Indeed, how can any one doubt it after reading the denunciations He hurled into the teeth of the Pharisees?

But we must not carry this point too far. Christ nowhere directly advocated war. War, as we have said, is an affair of the state. It is a political issue, and with such He positively refused to have anything to do. His kingdom was not of this earth. But the Jews, living under a theocratic government, could not understand this. He, the Christ, "Son of David," "King of the Jews," must be a political king despite all denials. (When He answered the Pharisee, so to say, over His shoulder, telling him to "render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," they believed the reply evasive. It was, on the contrary, in exact accord with the position He assumed throughout. It was the same as saying, "I have nothing to do with that.") He made this entirely clear when brought before Pilate. The Jewish council charged Him with sedition. He was to them a political disturber and their preconceived ideas made a

defence before them impossible. Consequently Christ did not attempt to defend Himself before them. It was different with the Roman governor who had no prejudices of this kind to cloud his judgment. Pilate, who was certainly acquainted with the main features of his teachings, saw no political significance in them, and had consequently no quarrel with Him. "Art thou the king of the Jews?" he asked. The question was suspicious, wherefore Christ frankly inquired as to the attitude of His judge. "Sayest thou these things of thyself, or have others told it thee of me?" The answer was convincing and showed Pilate not in sympathy with the council. "Am I a Jew? Thine own nation and the chief priests have delivered thee unto me: what hast thou done?" To this came at once the full and satisfactory answer: "My kingdom is not of this earth; if my kingdom were of this earth, *then would my servants fight*, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence." But Pilate, wishing to know why He had permitted Himself to be called the "King of the Jews," asked again: "Art thou a king (at all) then"? "Thou sayest that I am a king," Christ replied. "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world that I should bear witness to the truth. Everyone that is of the truth heareth my voice."

"I find no fault in him at all," Pilate told the council. That is to say, the charge of sedition, of

political teaching, was declared groundless by the only person in authority whose mind was not hopelessly warped.

Christ could and did convince a Roman proconsul that His teachings had no direct political bearing, but He could not convince the Jews of His day. Neither, it seems, has He convinced the "Jews" of our own day. Eighteen hundred years of costly blundering have taught some of us nothing. If the Saviour's teachings were intended to apply directly to the affairs of men taken collectively, there is no reason why the church and state should not be united, and the latter subordinate to and under the direction of the former. This plan was tried during the Middle Ages and filled whole centuries with war and confusion. Step by step, with infinite labor and some injustice, this work has been undone in all the European countries, although the problem is not yet fully solved. In proportion as governments become more democratic they shake off the ecclesiastical yoke. It was not, then, without some cause that many people opened their eyes in astonishment when they saw America's foremost apostle of democracy taking the road back into the past.

But why, asks the pacifist, cannot we apply these ideal truths to political affairs? Granted that they were meant for the individual, it must nevertheless be conceded that politics could not suffer from the infusion of so pure an element. We might answer

him by saying that whenever the attempt has been made it has brought disaster. But such a reply would hardly convince a doctrinarian who from his very nature is not impressed by facts. Not perceiving the essential nature and function of the moral code, he cannot reconcile himself to the idea of compromise. He is unaware of the fatal solecism in his reasoning which completely wrecks his main thesis—arbitration, judicial decision—rather than resort to arms. Certainly he cannot deny that our codes are not uniform or that legitimate interests do actually conflict. The person who preens himself upon the perfection of his conduct is very frequently a cantankerous individual who is forever at odds with his neighbors. If he were entirely honest with himself he would be obliged to concede that he cannot pass twenty-four hours without proving false to some of his sublime categories. For this world, because it is limited in extent, is necessarily a world of compromises and can therefore have nothing to do with absolutes except as moral sign-posts indicating the general direction in which we should go. The majority of judicial decisions are, in fact, compromises. They often represent as much a choice between evils as between good. That is only saying in a concrete way that there is no such thing as ideal justice. The solution of every problem lies in the elements of the problem itself; in the living values of everyday life. Just as far as we permit

the abstract ideal to blind us to this fact shall we fail to do real justice. In this circumstance lies the reason for the frequent failure of radical measures. In the name of a great and pure idea they call for unreasonable sacrifices on the part of those who are not personally responsible for the position in which they find themselves. The medicine is good, provided the patient can stand it. W. G. Langworthy Taylor, Professor Emeritus of the University of Nebraska, has recently cast this truth into the form of a general formula. "It is of the essence of all bad reasoning," he says, "to apply abstract ideals directly to practical affairs." The student of the social sciences will instantly perceive the penetrating and universal character of this formula. It is a generalization for practical purposes, of the fact that these sciences reveal underlying factors over which the will of man has little or no control. These factors stand in spite of all moral codes and no legislative enactments can alter them. They simply must be accepted and our reform measures accommodated to their requirements. Our work, then, can be only the work of amelioration within comparatively narrow limits. The first task of the reformer is to discover the width of this margin. Everything attempted outside of it breeds mischief and nothing else. That leaves no room for the *ex cathedra* pronouncements of the doctrinarian.

We may assume the pacifist to insist at this point

that since we admit that not even the code of the individual can be concretely realized in all cases, there is no reason why we should not apply it to international affairs and accept the unsatisfactory results as we do in private life. This does, in fact, raise a somewhat difficult problem for which those who have had it to face in actual affairs have not always found a logically correct solution. So Mr. Bryan quite naturally finds fault with our President when he excuses his preparedness programme on the ground that he stands in a position different from that of the private citizen. But Mr. Wilson is by no means the first statesman from whom an answer has been required only to discover that he could not give a satisfactory one. Frederick the Great, one of the best and most enlightened statesmen of the eighteenth century, faced the same dilemma and tried to justify himself by saying that when the interests of the people were at stake, he, their king, must sacrifice himself to save them. By breaking the code of a gentleman, which he held admitted of no exceptions, he dishonoured himself for the sake of his people. That, in the eyes of many, he did so in the seizure of Silesia and the division of Poland, is common knowledge. This, obviously, is not satisfactory. The real and satisfactory explanation lies in subsequent history which shows that the net results, considering society as a whole, stand on the right side of the account. At the time of the French

Revolution a person hardly known to history, Mosneron de l'Aunay, boldly maintained that there are two codes, one for the individual, another for the statesman. He was arguing against the sudden abolition of slavery in the French West Indies and said that the application of the ideal principles of the National Assembly as expressed in the declaration of the rights of man would lead to untold disasters. The Assembly accepted his view and followed a compromise policy, but even this was resented and all parties suffered. There are many to-day who believe that we acted too radically in the matter of our own slavery issue during the middle of the last century.

While I am not prepared to assert that the conduct of the private person and that of the statesman do not fall under the same general formula, it is clear that the formula must be differently applied by them. The individual is a very small element in a large and complex whole. His freedom of movement is, theoretically, almost without limit. His physical environment is not fixed for all time. He has, therefore, a large number of choices—chances, if the reader prefers. Survival depends upon many factors. He can, in consequence, adopt a rigid code without undue risk of exhausting his choices. For the nation, on the other hand, the world is a small place. Its activities are relatively circumscribed and hedged in by the activities of other nations. It

has, therefore, a few choices and cannot hamper itself with a code so rigid as to block its actions at every step. Having but few choices, it must develop them in accordance with a consistent and well-laid plan. This gives us national policies and explains why nations usually elect to fight rather than see these policies completely upset. The question of survival is logically much more acute with the nation than with the individual.

If we turn now to a principle in human development which some sociologists have termed "imitation" we shall see why a nation cannot do otherwise than press these choices. Not to do so would bring them first to anarchy or communism and finally to a logical *impasse* as to their course. For, if every nation voluntarily surrendered all its choices the moment they came into conflict with those of another nation, they could have no value for the reason that they could not be utilized. The idea of property rests upon rival or conflicting pretensions. Theoretically, indeed, we can do away with private property by vesting all pretensions in the state; but if we extend this policy to the state also, all pretensions whatsoever disappear. The non-resister is, therefore, a person who shirks his part of the world's burden. The ideal can be practised by a limited number at the expense and under the protection of the rest. When it becomes universal all price, all exchange, all idea of property what-

soever, disappears, and things come to an absolute standstill. Universal non-resistance in the world of society is exactly the same as it is in the physical world—inertia, death.

This idea can be made somewhat clearer by using the sociologist's conception of society as an unstable equilibrium. With non-resistance as a universal code this equilibrium would become completely stable; that is, dead. Activity is conflict; and it is upon the character and degree of this conflict, upon the character and degree of this instability, that all progress or retrogression depends. This makes it clear that a nation cannot refuse to press its choices. To do so is treason to mankind. It can sometimes modify them, agree to arbitration or compromise; but it cannot have rights under a theory which compels voluntary surrender of them, because without this pressure there can be no equilibrium, and without equilibrium, no conception of justice, the essential character of which is the balancing of one thing against another. When, therefore, the non-resister says that "might does not make right," he affirms that which is exactly the opposite of the truth, for without might right is impossible. It is one of those mischievous phrases which appeal to the shallow mind and permit it to dispense with the effort required for independent thought. It twists the issue awry and confounds the application of a thing with the thing itself. For there is no inherent wrong in

force. It has no moral quality whatever. It can receive this quality only through the manner and object of its use. It is, in fact, often wrongfully employed, but we cannot for that reason discard its use altogether.

In the language of common sense the answer to the non-resister runs about like this: "No, might does not necessarily make right. Nor does it necessarily make wrong. But since the unrighteous do actually use it, the righteous must, perforce, use it in order that righteousness may not perish from the earth." Our Secretary of War has recently made this reply, in substance.

If, then, we lay aside all hair-splitting, all strained interpretations, what results from the study of the Gospels in this connection? Christ has summed up the essential conditions of salvation in two commandments. "Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely, this, thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." (Mark xii.)

It is quite possible to translate these commandments into the language of experience or science and show that they really are indispensable to a full and healthy life. From our study of the biological sciences we know that our lives are circumscribed and that absolute unselfishness is incompatible with

the conditions of existence. Because we are admonished to love our neighbour as ourselves it does not follow that we must give him all our possessions or permit him to appropriate them. We could not help him in this way, for progress depends on exertion, on struggle, even conflict. Our neighbour is entitled to what he earns by his own exertion, nothing more. We may help him, at a pinch, and receive back from him the same help when we ourselves suffer from some calamity. We have long since learned that unlimited or indiscriminate charity does more harm than good. In the long run we cannot help each other. We must help ourselves. On the other hand, the purely biological impulses, unrestrained by moral considerations, lead to barbarism and the ultimate extinction of the species. The moral sense comes to effect a compromise. When we discover that our moral ideals cannot, from their side, be applied in their perfection, when we observe that in spite of all our endeavours life remains harsh, the world burdened with individuals broken by the struggle, we are shocked. But if at this point we begin to despise ourselves, revile the human race, and, so to say, shake our fist at heaven, we surrender to a pessimism which is, in the end, as destructive as the unrestrained forces of evolution. A reconciliation to these, our fundamental limitations, is an indispensable necessity. Christianity, like many other religions, conceives of God as the Father who is re-

sponsible for these limitations. We cannot quarrel with them without quarrelling with the Father. This is the one thing we must accept on faith as children accept the word of their earthly father. The simile used by Christ accords perfectly with our inner experience, for only in the humility of this faith is to be found the solution or reconciliation which is the foundation stone of Christianity. It is the kingdom that is within us, the "peace that surpasseth all understanding." Only after we have reached this kingdom can we truly comprehend the nature and object of altruistic motives. Having reached a state of obedience to the first commandment (which is not a commandment at all, but an appeal), we can turn to fulfil intelligently the requirements of the second, namely, the work of amelioration in accordance with the laws of progress.

This work is concerned largely with those who are on the point of succumbing to the difficulties of the life struggle. The word *service* has lately been much overworked in this connection. To be of real service means, above all, that we attend well to our own business and permit others to do the same. Christianity does not mean universal pauperization as some writers appear to have assumed. What is needed is self-restraint rather than charity as commonly understood. That much we must concede to the pacifist.

But there is at this point also another peculiar

lapse, a crucial inadequacy, in the reasoning of many persons. This was brought out in a striking way a few years ago in connection with the theory, or supposed theory, of Dr. Osler, that all "useless" persons should be chloroformed without further ado. It is imagined by some, notably the pacifists, that such action would be the logical fulfilment of the evolutionary mandate. Now, there are several glaring fallacies in this assumption. For, in the first place, there is no such thing as a useless person in the view of evolution. The moral code (the utilitarian, properly understood) is in evolution, and has been in it from the beginning, not outside it. And this is true whether we regard the moral idea as specially infused from "above" in the shape of the religious tradition, or as merely a corrective reflex from the primary biological impulses themselves. These so-called useless persons are not useless because our moral nature still finds an object in retaining them. They have, moreover, served a constructive purpose at one period of their existence whether they be now merely too old for further active work or naturally inefficient. The aged person has done his share toward the work of the whole and is in justice entitled to his share of the reward as long as life shall last. The naturally inefficient are inefficient only in a relative sense, and are a necessary element in the aggregate because without them the law of selection and survival is inconceiv-

able. There is, besides, no way of determining whether or not, in a given case, these unfortunates may not possess a reserve which will prove them very valuable some day.

The second error lies in the assumption that evolution regards only the final aim or goal of the race and holds the process by which it is attained as of no consequence. There is nothing in the evolutionary theory to justify such an assumption, because, as has just been said, the moral code is part and parcel of the whole. On the other hand, the supermoral pacifist who insists that the moral ideal must be enforced at all cost, sacrifices the object for the process. To him the process is all in all, whether he is conscious of it or not. Man is for the code, not the code for man. He forgets Christ's answer to the critics who blamed His disciples for plucking the ears of grain on the Sabbath. This is a necessary deduction from his belief in a code ideally perfect. In such a code the object is necessarily included because if an ulterior object were postulated it would be impossible not to concede something to it in the process of attaining it, since our means are limited. Not much argument is required to show that no true Christian can hold such a doctrine, because Christianity is based on the very fact of our imperfections. The perfect being needs no Saviour. "He that is whole needs not the physician, but he that is sick." The true Christian strives to

attain the most perfect conduct *practically* possible, with the full knowledge that perfection is unattainable. He retains the hope, the faith, that there is always the chance to improve, that God has still something to reveal to us as time passes and we develop capacities and motives we do not now possess. That is the essence of faith, and in that alone lies the need of it. Our conduct could not be theoretically perfect without a full knowledge of the final goal. Since we do not know our ultimate fate, cannot discover a single absolute good, we must grope along and fit our imperfect means to suit our imperfect vision.

There is no longer any room for a quarrel between Christianity and the theory of evolution, for the latter is but an explanation of the whole life process of which Christianity is a helpful element. No other theory is logically tenable among a people who believe in a cosmic universe. Whether we like it or not, Christianity will be, is already being interpreted in the light of our positive knowledge and taking hold of our minds with a force and a meaning such as it has not shown for many years. We are discovering that the two are in perfect harmony and that Christianity has not come as an authoritative denunciation of everything that is human, as was once supposed.

This discussion is, by no means, purely academic. It has a direct application to world politics. In

war the question of survival has to do with political groups, as such, and not primarily with the individual. The politically inefficient, like the ancient kingdom of Poland, lose their political identity or independence. The Pole is individually brilliant but politically a blunderer. If there is any truth or utility at all in the political idea, why should he have been permitted to continue to do that for which he was so obviously unfitted? Again, if there is any truth in the idea of human solidarity, why was it not right that he should give way in this phase of his activity to those who have shown a greater aptitude, provided no hardships are imposed on him beyond those naturally resulting from his incapacity? In the long run it is right that the earth's resources should be developed under the direction of those who are most competent. That is a dangerous conclusion but there is no escape from it. Nor has the principle ever been seriously called in question where uncivilized or semi-civilized people were concerned. Criticism is made only of the manner in which the process of supplanting is carried out. The conquest is often quite advantageous to both conqueror and the conquered. This was notably the case when the Roman, highly gifted politically, conquered the politically incompetent but brilliantly intellectual Greek.

How dangerous is this principle we can see from the present attitude of Germany which claims the

right to rule by conquest wherever she is able to conquer. Her hideous mistake has arisen out of her own overgrown conceit and a consequent misapplication of the principle. In the first place, she seems to think that conquest carries with it the right of at least partial extermination of the conquered. She has been needlessly and aimlessly brutal. It is true, also, that a world purpose could not be served by her occupation of Belgium because the Belgians have shown notable efficiency, politically. Nor will many people concede the German contention that the French have forfeited their right to participate in world affairs as a politically independent unit. But the French themselves have long felt that unless they somehow increase their population so as to make their portion of the earth serve a larger number of the growing whole, they must sooner or later give way to those who will do so, no matter how perfectly those who now live in France may be served politically. For the political unit, like the individual, holds possession of its portion of the earth only so long as it makes an adequate use of it, unless it can muster from somewhere the force to make its tenure good.

Normal Angell, in trying to escape the consequences of this principle, has denied flatly that the political idea, political government, has any positive or constructive value whatever. He limits its usefulness to the negative function of policing. He

was driven to this extreme position in order to be able to declare that there is no economic motive for war, that war is economically futile. We cannot go into this contention here further than to say that Mr. Angell's proofs are anything but convincing to the careful reader.

To come back now to the arguments directed from Christianity, it has been said that Christ taught us that all men are brothers and that war is, therefore, abhorrent. But the word "brotherhood," when used in this sense, merely affirms the solidarity of the race. We are interdependent, have many common needs, ideas, and we hope, a common destiny. From this fact it is concluded that we must under no circumstances come to blows over the affairs of this life. It requires no profound logic to show that this conclusion is unwarranted. For only in this solidarity, this brotherhood, can we find a justification for demanding the sacrifices imposed by war. War is a violent and costly method of solving a problem for which we have not yet discovered a better way. The hardships fall with a special force upon the loser. Now, if the loser had no interest in our destiny, were not responsible as a member of the race, for his share in bringing about the conditions leading to the war, he could not justly be called on to pay anything toward the solution of the difficulty. An attack upon a race with which we have nothing in common would, indeed, be abhorrent to our sense of

right. This is only one phase of the general confusion existing in the minds of the pacifists, who imagine that because interests are every day becoming more intermingled, there will be less occasion for war. On the contrary, it is in this very multitude of the points of contact that the danger of war lies. If we never came within speaking distance of our neighbours we should never have cause for quarrel.

Under the circumstances it was natural enough that the Saviour's teachings should be taken literally and as unconditional pronouncements from above. And yet there is abundant indication that this is not the way they were intended. Christ appealed to the understanding and sought to bring conviction indirectly. He frequently expressed impatience, not so much at the unbelief of his auditors as at their lack of insight. That He was believed in was sufficiently attested by the fact that so many were stirred and followed Him. But they asked for a "sign" that He spoke with authority and must be accepted on that account. This demand was in itself evidence that they had not penetrated to the heart of His message. In the later Gospels, and especially in John, He is represented as making a conscious effort to impress His hearers with the fact that He spoke with authority. In Mark, however, we are told that after He had been asked for a sign He "sighed deeply in his spirit and saith, 'Why

doth this generation seek after a sign? Verily I say unto you, There shall be no sign given unto this generation.'” (Ch. viii.) So also in Luke, “Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?” (In a papyrus of the third century recently discovered in the ruins of Oxyrrhinkhus, in Egypt, occurs this passage, inconceivably pathetic in the despair of it: “Jesus saith, ‘I stood in the midst of the world and in the flesh was I seen of them, and I found all men drunken, and none found I athirst, and my soul grieveth over the sons of men, because they are blind in their hearts and see not.’” Again: “And whoever shall know himself shall find it [the kingdom]. Strive, therefore, to know yourselves, and ye shall be aware that ye are the sons of the almighty Father, and ye shall know that ye are in the city of God, and that ye are the city.” Clearer still: “Jesus saith, Let him who seeks (not) cease until he finds, and when he finds he shall be astonished, astonished he shall reach the kingdom, and having reached the kingdom he shall rest.’”

Is anything more needed to show that the pacifists have utterly misread the spirit of Christ's teachings and misunderstood the word *peace* as used in the Gospels? (This peace is the rest that comes to the individual soul upon the discovery of an adequate motive. For the primitive man a formal religion of authority sufficed. But in groping toward the light, we have become self-conscious and introspec-

tive. The process of evolution is a hard and cruel one. Its object in human society, the sociologists tell us, is the integration of personality. But the product, we feel, does not justify the process, if the personality is dissolved to perish with the dissolution of the body in which it is housed. We require the belief in a future that shall transcend evolution and make the suffering worth while. Without that we could not endure the strain and many personalities would be shattered long before they had reached the limit of their capacity for growth. Faith in the Maker of all things gives us the "peace" and courage to continue in the work allotted to us here. Love the Father is, therefore, the first commandment, for without it the things of this life would be but as Dead Sea fruit. This is the very heart of the great message of the "Prince of Peace," and there is not one word in it to bid the clamour of the long roll cease.

V

THE RATIONAL CAUSES AND FUNCTIONS OF WAR

The theory of evolution holds a large place in the literature on the Peace and War question. The militarists find in it their most effective arguments. Their material is already partly worked up in the social sciences, especially history, economics, and sociology. War is here given a rational explanation and assigned a positive function in the development of civilization. In the light of these sciences it ceases to be accidental or wholly evil. Judgments are based not on abstract morals but upon objective facts viewed dynamically. Evils are weighed against benefits and war rises to the dignity of a social institution. Many sociologists regard war as both inevitable and indispensable to progress. General von Bernhardt's famous phrase "War is a biological necessity of the first order" has the sanction of these disinterested students.

The wrath of the pacifists against these sciences is, therefore, natural. To meet this situation their writers follow different courses. Some of them ignore both the theory of evolution itself and the works based upon it. Others declare the theory

false, while a third group seeks to show that the scientists who have used it for the interpretation of social data have misunderstood it.

To the last named group belonged the Russian sociologist, Jacques Novicow. It was he, I believe, who coined the phrase, "Social Darwinists," to designate the false evolutionists, as he maintained, who preached the gospel of war and conflict. His works have proved a veritable arsenal for pacifist writers, among them the master pacifist, Norman Angell. Dr. George Nasmyth has summarized his thesis in a work entitled *Social Progress and the Darwinian Theory* distributed gratis by the Carnegie Peace Foundation. The argument is too long to give here even in a *résumé*. Nor is that necessary. For both the method and the essential ground of attack can be made clear by a few selections. It should be said, however, that the work of Nasmyth is something more than a condensation of Novicow's works. Novicow had classed Darwin with the "Social Darwinists," while Nasmyth denies that Darwin held the obnoxious views of these so-called false evolutionists. He claims him as a pacifist who abhorred the doctrine of conflict among men. He also gives a number of quotations from various writers pro and con. This is the most valuable part of the book although it is unfortunate that he did not make an attempt to gain a consistent view for himself. For, if he had done this and had understood the sense of

his authorities he certainly would not have written the rest of his book.

"The primary error of those who have distorted Darwin's theory almost beyond recognition is one of stupendous magnitude," says Nasmyth. "It consists in ignoring completely the existence of the physical universe! The cause of progress is assumed to be, not the struggle of man with his environment, from which he gets food, clothing, shelter, and all the other necessities, but the struggle of man with man, a struggle which is by its nature unproductive and fruitless."

This will be amazing news to the "Social Darwinists!" It sounds impressive, and were it true there would be no occasion for further argument. Incidentally it proves to what audacious expedients some pacifist writers will resort when hard pressed. Of course, no evolutionist is guilty of such a lapse as is here imputed to them because the distinctive feature of the evolutionary philosophy consists in its interpretation of life with reference to the character and extent of the "physical universe." What we have to do with here is a favorite trick of Norman Angell, from whose "Great Illusion" Dr. Nasmyth has probably taken the passage we have quoted. This trick consists in misrepresenting an important principle of the opposition and then demolishing this dummy with a vast show of learning. This species of dishonesty is rather common with pacifist writers

although none, to my knowledge, have employed it as systematically as Mr. Angell has done. Were the general reader a little better informed in this field of thought or in the habit of reading more carefully no one would risk so barefaced an attempt to mislead him. But everyone knows what a profound impression the works of Mr. Angell made before the war. Many highly educated people accepted the "Great Illusion" as irrefutable. Several learned reviewers compared it with the "Origin of Species" of Darwin as introducing a revolution in the world's thought.¹ Those who desire to understand the mechanism through which this effect was produced should read "The Main Illusions of Pacifism" of Mr. G. G. Coulton.

To return to the argument, the "Social Darwinists" do not ignore the existence of the "physical universe." Some of them are at most guilty of having exaggerated the importance of conflict

¹ In his fourth edition Mr. Angell prints a large number of these flattering reviews. Thus in the *Chicago Evening Post* of February 17, 1911, Mr. Floyd Dell says, "The book, being read, does not simply satisfy curiosity; it disturbs and amazes. It is not, as one would expect, a striking expression of some familiar objections to war. It is instead—it appears to be—a new contribution to thought, a revolutionary work of the first importance, a complete shattering of conventional ideas about international politics; something corresponding to the epoch-making 'Origin of Species' in the realm of biology."

In *La Petite République* of December 17, 1910, M. Henri Turot writes: "J'estime, pour ma part, 'La Grande Illusion' doit avoir, au point de vue de la conception moderne de l'économie politique internationale, un retentissement égal à celui de 'l'Origine des espèces.'"

among men. Nor is there any adequate reason for distinguishing between them and the evolutionists generally. An attack upon them is an attack upon the whole school of evolution, that is to say, the whole of evolutionary science. So far are they from ignoring the existence of the physical universe that they have been accused of "materialism" because of the emphasis they lay upon the importance of it in the study of human conduct and institutions. From beginning to end they stress the economic motive as against the purely idealistic impulses. They refuse to concede that life can be understood independently of its environment.² They do *not* say that progress

² Dr. Nasmyth quotes two passages from the works of Felix Le Dantec which he imagines disprove the contentions of the "Social Darwinists." These passages give so excellent and clear a statement of the very heart of the whole evolutionary theory that I think it worth while to quote them in full.

"The life of a living being results from two factors: the being and the environment. At each instance the vital or functional phenomena do not reside in the being alone, nor in the environment alone, but in the actual relations which exist between the being and the environment."

Again, "It was considered formerly that the living being existed by itself within its limiting surface independently of the surrounding environment, but this idea contains a manifest error derived from the old vitalistic theories, in which it was supposed that a vital principle animated the living body and was localized in it. In reality the living being is the result of a struggle between two factors: the substance localized within the surface of the animal—the body of the animal—on the one side; and on the other side, the surrounding environment. . . . *Life is the struggle itself between the being and the surroundings.* . . . (Italics mine.) The immediate phenomena of the struggle take place between the individual and its surroundings much more often than between one individual and another individual. The direct struggle is the

does not depend upon the struggle with the physical universe, or that it depends upon the struggle of man with man. What they *do* say is that the primary struggle is with the environment and that this struggle eventually leads to the secondary struggle of man with man, and that *both* are causes of progress.

It must be confessed that some confusion has crept into the discussion. There are several different kinds of struggle and conflict, and militarist writers have not always been careful to keep them distinct. As a result some of their generalizations have been too sweeping. They have sometimes confused the conflict between different species with that within the same species thus leading to false analogies when the theory is applied to the question of war. The carnivora do not, as a rule, prey upon struggle of man against his environment; this struggle is life."

Those idealists who, without repudiating the evolutionary theory, still persist in erecting a false antithesis between spiritual and material values should ponder the above statements very carefully. Perhaps they would then be convinced that if this antithesis is not pure nonsense it serves no useful object in the way of analysis, but on the contrary darkens counsel. Nasmyth, overlooking the really valuable part of the statement, fixes upon the platitude contained in the sentence: "The immediate phenomena of the struggle take place between the individual and its surroundings much more often than between one individual and another individual." This, he says, disproves the contentions of the "Social Darwinists!" But the "Social Darwinists" are not writing for tricky High School debaters. They are writing for people who really seek information who will see that they have taken the direct struggle for granted, since the evolutionary theory means nothing without it. Pp. 59-60.

members of their own species, although they sometimes do so. The conflict among themselves is indirect as when a pack of wolves devour a kill and each struggles with the other for as much of it as possible, and in the exhaustion of the hunting grounds when the success of one pack means the starvation of another. In this latter sense their struggle is of the primary kind to which all living things are subject, including man. In the vegetable kingdom and among the herbivora this is the prevailing mode of struggle leading, in most species, only occasionally to direct conflict. The discussion is further confused by the loose use of the terms "genus" and "species." The human race is really a genus but is invariably treated in the argument as if it were composed of but one species.

But I do not think that these analogies count for much in the discussion. The fact that some of the lower animals fight among themselves gives no justification for men to do the same. It merely illustrates the pressure to which all life is subject and thus helps to make clear what it is that drives men to kill each other. It is an aid to the understanding but gives no clue whatever to the solution of the moral problem.

How does the secondary struggle of man with man arise out of the primary struggle of man with the physical universe? A few simple illustrations will make this clear. When gold was discovered in

California large numbers of people hurried to the scene, many more than could possibly find productive claims. The result was a scramble for the best locations involving trickery, "claim jumping" and murder. That part of the "physical universe" which was the object of exploitation, gold, was too small to satisfy the demand. Some people were left without a chance to exploit. They therefore began the secondary struggle of man with man to obtain this chance. It may be conceded that they ought not to have done so, but they lacked a motive strong enough to check them. Theoretically all those involved in the venture might have acted much more sensibly. They might have organized and worked the whole field in common, thus equalizing the returns in the distribution. But the evolutionist is not dealing with hypothetical men. He takes them as he finds them and explains how they have actually behaved in the past and what were the driving motives which caused them to behave as they did in any given case.

A case of somewhat wider application is furnished by the contests over grazing lands on our western plains. These lands were at first ample to satisfy all demands. But as settlements advanced, as herds grew in size and number, and when sheep were introduced along with cattle, pasturage became short and innumerable killings and miniature wars resulted.

Finally, we may take the settlement of a whole

virgin territory to illustrate the manner in which the "physical universe" causes the universal struggle of man with man. The settlers first to arrive select what seems to them the most desirable sites. There is little occasion for conflict at this time since the choice is wide. But as more settlers arrive the choice narrows, forcing the acceptance of decidedly inferior lands, the competition increases in severity and sometimes results in "claim jumping" and murder, as in the case of mining settlements. Finally, when all the land considered worth taking has passed into private possession, a loose monopoly in land has been established, which then begins to rise in value, that is, becomes more difficult to secure. Those who now seek land in this locality must bargain for the price, which rises constantly as the population grows and increases the demand for the products of the land. Meanwhile all other lines of industry have grown along with that of farming, such as mining, lumbering, milling, transportation, merchandizing, and so on. All this time the monopoly in natural resources has become more complete and more exacting in its demands upon the rest of the community. The economic struggle tends to become more tense, more highly charged with the possibilities for trouble.

The complete appropriation of natural resources does not imply that life will immediately become harder. On the contrary, conditions usually ease

up for a time because of the division of labor and co-operation. But eventually, if the population continues to grow, natural resources will be strained, raw materials increase relatively less than the population, which, in the absence of a cheap outside supply, will lead to smaller returns per person and so to a lower standard of living. If the same tendency continues there will finally come a time when positive elimination of the less successful will set in. The struggle for survival, though not in the extremest form known in the animal world, has begun to have the same effect in the restriction of numbers.

The serious student will see at once that the above discussion gives merely an outline explanation of the Malthusian theory of population now accepted by economists as correct in essentials. No one, assuredly, will assert that this doctrine ignores the "existence of the physical universe." And yet it is this theory of population of Malthus that suggested to Darwin and Wallace the greater and more penetrating theory of evolution upon which the "Social Darwinists," attacked by Nasmyth, have based their works. This Dr. Nasmyth understood very well. But he could not hope to refute them if he stated their proposition correctly. Therefore he misrepresented it in such a way as to make room for several hundred pages of more or less irrelevant material, carefully side-stepping the dangerous places, and all the time hoping, no doubt, that the reader

is being greatly impressed with his argument. He knew, of course, that sooner or later he would be called on to discuss the Malthusian doctrine of population. It is the veritable *bête noir* of the neo-socialists and pacifists. To omit it altogether from his discussion would have been too obviously a confession of weakness. But it would not do to mention it before the reader had forgotten his bald falsehood as to the position of the "Social Darwinists," because in that case his inconsistency would hardly have escaped the most careless reader. So, after long wanderings, of windings in and out, he finally comes to the point and attempts to refute, not the true position of his scientific opponents, but as nearly their true position as he seems capable of stating it.

To illustrate his theory Malthus gave two formulas. Population, he said, increases in geometrical progression, 1-2-4-8-16-32-64-128-256, etc. Subsistence increases in arithmetical progression, 1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8-9, etc. This discloses the tendency for population to outgrow the means of subsistence. His whole discussion, however, shows that he intended these formulas merely as an aid to the understanding, and not as representing the exact historical truth. Dr. Nasmyth should, of course, have taken this theory in its modern form as found in the works of the economists of today. But that would have been hopeless, since he could not even attack

Malthus fairly. Instead of refuting the theory, the tendency of population to outgrow subsistence, he attacked the accuracy of the formulas given merely to illustrate the idea.

"But the true theory," he says, "if we take into account the law of excelleration whereby ten men working together and practising specialization and division of labor, produce not ten times as much as one separately, but one hundred times as much, would be as follows: Population 1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8-9. Productive power 1-4-9-16-25-36-49-64-81-100."

This "law of excelleration" is evidently something new and unknown to the dull students of the economic sciences. I have never before heard of it and he does not tell us where he gets it. He nevertheless assures us gravely that this formula is actually being verified in all civilized countries. But this did not yet seem to him to crush Malthus sufficiently, so he added that the latter taught that "every increase in population results in a decrease in prosperity and a scarcity of foodstuffs." He hoped, no doubt, that the reader would not notice this new misrepresentation. If Malthus could be saddled with a statement so evidently false it would tend to discredit his whole work and incline the reader to look more favorably upon the Nasmyth formulas.

Needless to say, he produces no evidence or authority for the statement that population increases in the 1-2-3-4-5 etc. progression. As a matter of

established fact it sometimes increases in the geometrical progression, that is, doubles in a generation.

Let us now consider his assertion that "Ten men working together and practising specialization and division of labor, produce not ten times as much as each working separately, but one hundred times as much," which the author offers in answer to Malthus and the economists of today. Even were this true in special cases such as frontier communities, it would not in the least affect the contention that there is a constant tendency for population to crowd upon the means of subsistence. As a matter of fact the co-operation called for in the formula has long been practised in all well settled communities. Can Dr. Nasmyth point to a single industry of consequence in which, by employing ten times as many men as are now employed the production would be increased a hundredfold? Could ten men on a quarter section of land produce fifteen hundred bushels of wheat per acre instead of the fifteen bushels now produced, or twenty-five hundred bushels of corn in place of twenty-five, ten thousand bushels of potatoes instead of one hundred? Could the mines produce one hundred times as much as they now do by employing ten times as many men? Could ten times as many men as are now engaged in fishing take a hundred times the weight of fish from the sea, or ten times as many shipbuilders construct

a hundred times as many ships? To maintain such a proposition is to accuse the leaders in all our industries of imbecility.

All this is the veriest nonsense and would not be worth discussing were it not for the fact that it is just this type of "science" which is seized upon by the press and dished up to readers whose training does not permit them to perceive the trickery. The reader meets with this sort of thing everywhere. The propaganda sees to that by distributing such books free of charge and by placing them on the shelves of our public libraries. Pacifist lecturers shout their substance from the platform. The half educated "intellectual" spreads it before the Chautauqua and women's clubs. Sooner or later it is carried to every church, club or organization in the land. The average person is not cynical enough to suspect a studied effort to deceive him, and if he were he would not in most cases have the means or the time to uncover the deception and obtain a correct view. The subject is involved and, while clear enough to one who has gone over the ground under honest guidance, lends itself easily to deception of the unwary or those wholly without systematic training in the social sciences. This offers something in the way of excuse for the hard pressed editor of a daily newspaper. He is frequently himself victimized and sometimes honest enough to correct the wrong he has done his readers when he learns what has hap-

pened to him. The relation between these works and the press is sometimes such as to provoke a good side-shaking laugh. Dr. Jordan, for instance, in his "War and the Breed" quotes an editorial from the *Nebraska State Journal* in support of his thesis, innocently failing to mention that this editorial was inspired by "The Human Harvest," an earlier edition of "War and the Breed," being, therefore, merely a partial summary of the very work in which it was cited as authority!

To resume the argument, the economists have accepted the Malthusian theory as essentially correct. They have found in it the basic idea of their science, namely, scarcity of economic goods, which is also the essential thing in the Darwinian theory of struggle for survival and the consequent selection, differentiation and elimination. Today we have the Malthusian doctrine restated and carefully qualified in the great economic law of diminishing returns which no economist worthy of the name now disputes. Prof. Alfred Marshall in particular has taken pains to show just what it means and does not mean. No intelligent reader could misunderstand it or fail to perceive what it implies with reference to the question of struggle. But I have never found it correctly stated in any pacifist work. The pacifists either misstate it, deny its truth or ignore it altogether. This law of diminishing returns,

briefly stated, is as follows: Given the environment, or natural resources, and the state of the productive arts including distribution, every increase in population tends to increase the difficulty of obtaining subsistence because the same effort and expense no longer return the same proportional amount of goods. Per contra, all other things remaining constant, every new natural resource and every improvement in the arts of production and distribution, tends to relieve the pressure. This, of course, does not apply to a new country in the course of settlement. It is true only of well settled territory where the appropriation of the "physical universe" is essentially complete. As a matter of historical fact, the two elements, population and the arts of production, do not remain in a constant ratio, but advance and recede alternately. Heavy pressure of population spurs the arts to new discoveries and greater production, after which the population increases again and takes up the "slack." This process may be repeated many times. Finally, however, an approximate limit is reached. Increased production becomes more and more difficult. The rate of profit, or saving, is lowered with each new application of labor or capital. The best talent can no longer secure the same relative amount of goods as compared with the number of people involved. Then either capital or labor, or both, must be con-

tent with less consumption. That means that the standard of living is lowered, and if the population continues to grow, want and starvation will set in for the less successful. When this stage is reached every species of social trouble may be looked for. Unrest, discontent, vice, theft and robbery, all are on the cards. Capital, no longer finding opportunities at home sufficient to tempt it, looks abroad and the pressure for "dollar diplomacy" arises, or rather, becomes acute, for foreign investments are sought and made long before the home situation has become so nearly stationary. The whole subject is complicated by the matter of distribution and maladjustment among the economic groups and factors. Where adjustment is perfect trouble will be delayed, that is, where capital and labor are nicely balanced and exploitation is scientifically directed, the full effect of the law of diminishing returns is postponed longer than it otherwise would be.

It may be conceded that a situation of this kind offers no valid excuse for the cutting of throats. That is not the question we are concerned with here. The pacifists deny that a real conflict of interests exists. They say that interests are "common," and that people are never in each other's way except wilfully so, and that no people can possibly gain anything by fighting. If all countries were equally exploited and all people equally efficient in exploitation this would be true from the purely economic

point of view.³ But this is not true and if it were true we should not be convinced of it in all cases.

³ Jules Sageret in a recent volume, *Philosophie de la Guerre et de la Paix*, makes an interesting suggestion on this point. In a rather full review of this work I find the following: M. Sageret voit "la clef de toute la question de la guerre" dans ce qu'il nomme le Problème de la *simultanéité*. "Si l'Allemagne avait fait moins d'enfants, elle n'aurait pas été tentée par ce sentiment de sa force, elle n'aurait pas fait la guerre—Si la France avait fait autant d'enfants que l'Allemagne, l'Allemagne n'ayant pas la supériorité de force numérique n'aurait pas été tentée—La vraie recette pacifiste consistait donc en l'adoption simultanée, par la France et l'Allemagne, du même taux de natalité." *Revue Générale du Droit*, Mai-Juin-Juillet, 1920.

I saw this revue too late to secure a copy of this work in time to read it. But it is evident that if the reviewer states the author's idea correctly, the most essential point is left untouched. He fails to see that if France were as densely populated as is Germany the latter could have no legitimate economic reason for attacking France unless she assumed that the German people are more efficient in exploitation than are the French. If the two were equally efficient Germany could gain nothing economically from the conquest except by direct exploitation of the French people, that is, by simply robbing them. As a matter of fact had the Germans succeeded they would have supported a larger population on this territory because they would have worked harder and would have existed on a lower standard of living as their crowded condition in Germany now forces them to do. M. Sageret denies positively that there is ever a true economic reason for war, that anything material can ever be gained by war, thus following Norman Angell on this point. The truth is that the relatively sparse population of France is a standing temptation to Germany to seize French territory in order to exploit it more thoroughly than the French are now doing, or at least support some of her people from it. But if France should adopt M. Sageret's suggestion, as many Frenchmen are today urging, and populate France as densely as Germany is populated, the primary motive of German attack would cease to exist quite aside from the fact that France would then be able to defend herself. In the interest of social progress it is to be hoped that France will not be reduced to adopting this alternative.

When a nation finds that the law of diminishing returns has become strongly operative within its boundaries it can do one of three things. It can voluntarily reduce the birth rate until it falls to the point where the whole population can secure a satisfactory living, that is, can live according to what it considers a minimum standard. Or it can continue its excessive birth rate and send its surplus population to less thoroughly exploited lands, if such are available. Or, lastly, it can break into its neighbor's territory and seize what it needs or what may be available for seizure in the shape of either finished goods or natural resources. Today such wars are usually for concessions of one kind or other, control of commerce, but more especially for colonial possessions.

This is not a matter of theory only, something vague and remote. The pressure actually exists in many places, such as portions of India, China, central and southern Europe, Japan and the British Isles. No league of nations, no method of international co-operation can relieve it short of pure international charity. Among the white or Caucasian races natural resources have been thrown open with little restriction to capital and immigrants, especially in the Western Hemisphere and the possessions of England, which is to say, in the most important portions of the relatively unex-

exploited parts of the world.⁴ The United States, for instance, have not been the least selfish in this matter. We have accepted the immigrant on absolutely equal terms with ourselves, much to our own damage in recent years. Nothing more is to be done in that direction that can appreciably affect the situation. It is the task of the pacifists and world federationists to say what more they have to propose in the way of international co-operation that promises relief from this basic difficulty. Dr. Nasmyth felt that something was expected of him on this point. He waived the whole matter aside by saying that there is no danger of over-population because the birth rate is decreasing throughout the civilized world. It is true that the birth rate is decreasing, but so is the death rate. It seems not to have occurred to him that this decrease is the best possible evidence of economic pressure. Nevertheless Japan is today openly making the plea that she must have an outlet for her surplus population just as Germany made this plea before the war.⁵ Therefore

⁴ See the excellent work, *The Stakes of Diplomacy*, by Walter Lippmann, which deals almost wholly with this subject of the struggle for possession or exploitation of the backward or semi-civilized areas of the world.

⁵ Reports like the following are continually coming out of Japan. "Tokio, Feb. 26. (By Mail)—Pointing out that Japan's population is increasing 800,000 yearly Ichizo Hatori, ex-governor of Hyogo prefecture, declared in the diet that the question of how this surplus population would be disposed of is a serious one. He called attention to the fact that there are immense difficulties in the way of emigration and wanted

Japan is aggressive in eastern Asia. North of China is land claimed by Russia but only sparsely settled which Japan evinces a strong desire to occupy, forcibly if necessary. The same cause has brought about the ugly situation in California and other western states where Japanese are not wanted under any circumstances. Japanese have been entering this country in spite of the efforts of both the Japanese and American governments to keep them out. Since they cannot be kept out as long as we offer them fair opportunities of competition we have begun to pass discriminatory laws to discourage them from coming here. Japan insists upon seeing in this action an humiliation for herself on the ground that it implies racial inferiority for the Japanese. Official assurances to the contrary have

to know the government's policy in dealing with the entire problem. Premier Hara admitted that the problem was grave, but he did not think it to be so pressing as some scholars and foreigners seemed to consider it. There was still room, he said, both in Japan and in the districts which might be called Japan's sphere of influence for absorbing the increasing population."

One cannot but sympathize with Japan in her effort to find room for her people. The area of the Japanese archipelago is something less than a hundred and fifty thousand square miles, less by about eight thousand square miles than that of the state of California, and only one-sixth of the land is arable, while her population is about sixty millions. Her rate of increase, therefore, is about the same as that of Germany before the war. In very truth they are making good use of the little spot of earth they occupy. They are a bright and admirable race, and were it not for the fact that their introduction into our country in large numbers would be certain to lead to serious trouble every Christian sentiment would urge us to let them come.

no effect on her. Unless we recede from our position she may make it a cause for war. What have the pacifists to offer in this matter? They have been strangely silent.

Nor is it altogether a question of absolute numbers. It has been truthfully said that the poorer classes today possess comforts not enjoyed by the nobility of the Middle Ages. From this it is argued that the human race is not pressed harder, if as hard, as a thousand years ago. That also may be granted without in the least affecting the argument. The fact of alternate pressure and relief is assumed in the thesis without reference to any special period. The theory of evolution would have no meaning under any other assumption. The important point is that in the long run increased numbers always take up the room freed by greater production. It is conceded likewise that, upon the whole, comforts increase with the general progress of civilization. The standard of living is rising viewed in long perspective. People cannot or will not today submit to conditions regarded as quite endurable a few centuries ago. The moment they feel themselves pressed below a certain minimum standard trouble begins even though that standard may be much above the standards of past ages.

The rivalry among the great powers today hinges on the relatively unexploited portions of the world inhabited by uncivilized or backward peoples. These

regions are "The Stakes of Diplomacy," as Mr. Walter Lippmann has phrased it in an excellent work by that title. This is in itself a fairly clear indication of the nature of the difficulty. Every nation wants larger natural resources under its own flag. It is not content with sending out its people to do their exploiting under foreign flags. They love their own type of government and culture. They have national ideals they wish to see prosper in the world. The question of military power also is involved. Both France and England found their colonies a valuable asset during the war. The possession of such territories adds security.

To all of this we invariably receive the reply, "Co-operation," co-operation on the basis of justice and human brotherhood. In what way is the idea of justice involved in this? It is a question of relative necessity arising out of the difference in conduct on the part of the people in the various countries. Can a people who have created large necessities through the habit of excessive procreation allege that they are unjustly treated if prevented from overflowing into the land of a neighboring people who have exercised greater foresight? Ought a people like the French who are exercising a rational birth control concede to the Slav and the Teuton the right to swamp the unoccupied parts of the world with their kind? I think that question is fairly open to argument and we shall have to

radically change our conceptions of justice and brotherhood before they can be brought into this discussion.

In his long address at Poli's Theatre in Washington in 1916 Norman Angell came upon this subject of overcrowded countries and the duty of the less crowded ones toward the former. It was ticklish ground for him. In *The Great Illusion* he had avoided the matter since it could not be made to square with his thesis.⁶ But he was now discuss-

⁶ It is hard to determine from *The Great Illusion* whether Mr. Angell did or did not see the real difficulty in the problem or whether he purposely avoided it. He denied that Germany is crowded because she had no colonies or that colonies would give her anything she does not possess already. Germany was to be congratulated, he thought, because colonial powers like England had the expense of policing great areas of the world which German people could exploit on equal terms with Englishmen without a penny of cost to them. Colonies cannot be "owned," he said, or directly exploited at the cost of the inhabitants. Therefore it was a positive disadvantage to administer them. Germany was compelled to bribe her people to go to her African colonies, and the whole colonial empire of France in Africa contained only twenty-five thousand Frenchmen. France spent much more on her colonies than she gained from them. Meanwhile Germany without developing her colonies increased her population by twenty millions in about forty years and supported her people by exploitation under foreign flags. Since Mr. Angell is a man without a country, having, though now an English subject, spent the greater part of his life in France and America, he cannot understand patriotism as other people feel it. He has no use for it and thinks people are foolish in the regret they feel at breaking their allegiance and going to live under a foreign government. He cites the Germans in America as proof that there is nothing in the patriotism business, for these expatriates, he says, are prosperous and glad to be quit of Germany. Why, then, he asked, should any country bother about colonies or vacant or partially exploited lands?

But this complacency on such a subject would hardly do

ing the evils of secret diplomacy and urging the advantages of open declarations of national policies. Then he asked: "What do I mean by saying that we should make our policy manifest? Do I mean that America should make a solemn declaration to the world announcing what she intends to do about immigration and trade rights and the open door and the rest of it for all the coming centuries? I know I have been credited with that. But really, you know, I am not a raving lunatic."

And that was all he had to offer us as to what we should do in a matter which he clearly believed might cause trouble some day. And yet our policy in these matters has never been a secret. Our policy regarding the open door all nations understand and our immigration policy is written in our statutes. Mr. Angell did not say that we had been unreasonable in any of these things. Evidently he could not think of anything that ought to be done that had not already been done. Nor did he find fault with the extremely liberal policy of England with regard to the same subjects. And yet the European nations were at that moment fighting over just such ques-

when speaking to an American audience two and a half years after the outbreak of the war when the German population in America had become a problem to us. It was too evident then that this liberality in the matter of immigration might not continue forever either in America or elsewhere. The element of time, which he had neglected in the *Great Illusion*, now attained significance, and with it his whole theory crumbled and fell to the ground.

tions as he was discussing. He knew of the American, Canadian, and Australian opposition to Oriental immigration and the danger connected with this opposition, but he had no suggestion as to how the danger might be avoided beyond open discussion, a discussion that had been carried on in the newspapers for years. He had completely forgotten that he, in common with other pacifists, had been in the habit of blaming the newspapers for inflaming national passions by their editorials on international differences.

The pacifists in general and Mr. Angell in particular endlessly reiterate that nations are interdependent and that by fighting each other they destroy much and create nothing. War makes scarcity more severe, they say. They have in mind finished goods, whereas the thing really involved is the *opportunity to exploit natural resources*, two vastly different things.

Let us make this clear by an example. A war between Japan and America would unquestionably destroy much property and would be certain to leave both countries much poorer at the end of the war. But should Japan win and force us to cede to her a dozen of our western states she would soon recover many times the cost of the war. A war of revenge aside, her people would, through their industry, soon exploit these states so thoroughly as to greatly relieve the pressure at home, first through emigra-

tion and second through the riches drawn from this territory. True, we should be poorer as a result of the war and the loss of the territory, but the total amount of goods available to the world would be greatly increased as a result of fuller exploitation.

Now, there are just two ways of international co-operation that might obtain substantially the same economic result without war. One is to permit the Japanese to enter at will as immigrants. The other to cede this territory voluntarily. In either case the white population would either soon starve or remove elsewhere. Is there anyone with the courage to suggest either of these alternatives?

In this problem we have the "economic necessity of war" as distinguished from the "Biological necessity." The two are very closely related. But economic scarcity is probably the most fundamental social fact and out of it issues every moral problem. It is scarcity in one environment that forces different types of exploitation and thus gives rise to variation and selection and to the origin of species. Radically different types of exploitation remove conflict because they do not encroach upon each other. They do not occupy the same place in the economy of nature. In the matter of subsistence they are not rival if we leave out of consideration the direct attack of the carnivora upon the herbivora and upon each other. The bee, for instance, is not a rival of the birds. There is no quar-

rel between them because they do not demand the same kinds of food. A fish will not quarrel with an antelope for the same reason, and the horse and the members of the bovine species are not very greatly in each other's way because the horse cannot get about very well in low and marshy land covered with underbrush nor protect itself against enemies in such an environment. It trusts to speed for safety and to the power of its hoofs when gathered in herds on the open prairie. The cow or buffalo has horns for defense which it can use anywhere, and the marshy land does not interfere much with locomotion, while trees and underbrush conceal it from its carnivorous enemies. In their natural state, then, the equine and bovine species do not clash seriously because their grazing grounds are of different types. The same principle holds throughout the whole animal world. Scarcity has enforced struggle and struggle has forced the property of protoplasm to express itself in different ways adapted to the various ways of exploitation so as to put all the resources of the environment to the fullest use. Through this versatility of protoplasm the inorganic physical universe is in part organized or transmuted into life. Air, earth, and water teem with life, each species fitting itself as much as possible to take up what no other species specifically demands. It is the struggle for existence that accounts largely for the differentiation in structure.

Sometimes the same cause operates inside the same species to bring about slighter variation, and in the human species, or genus, rather, struggle causes variation in mental character and social institutions. Some of us, notably the militarists and those who think that wars have served a constructive purpose, believe that this variation has a value for civilization. The pacifists and world federationists are prepared to put an end to this process and ultimately force an absolute uniformity. They believe in a universal standard. All their moral values are fused into the one word, "Unity." It is their ecstasy, their final dithyramb. They are weary and would find rest by reversing the universal process and return to the bosom of the "Great Unity." They want to get back home.

This, I will, concede, is drawing the extreme conclusion of the pacifist theory. Probably no pacifist will admit that such is his goal. But by stating the problem in this extreme form we can see more clearly another sense in which war is a "Biological necessity." For if struggle in the secondary sense plays so important a part in variation it follows that variation will be greatly obstructed when struggle, or war, is eliminated, unless indeed we can develop motives which will produce the same results without war. It is to be always remembered that the effect of variation is the introduction of new methods of exploiting environment, of transmuting environ-

ment into life. This always has been an advantage to all species in the past in alleviating the severity of conflict and will continue to be so in the partially self-conscious human species in the same way, and all the more so because a new method once discovered soon becomes the common property of the race. The sole matter honestly in dispute is whether or not the same results can be obtained in a less costly way or whether they are worth the cost at all. Beyond this rational inquiry must give way to faith—or scepticism. Whether Nature is purposeful or blind and accidental we cannot say. It is equally futile to ask Her whether She is interested wholly in the quantity of life or aims also at quality, supposing that ultimate moral values exist. We must postulate such values for the guidance of our own species, constructing them in the light of such knowledge as we possess or think we possess. For we cannot be wholly rational in our conduct unless we at least assume some more or less definite goal. Our secondary moral values are determined by what we conceive this goal to be, and that doubtless accounts for the endless confusion of counsel and violent disagreements. To one man it is Justice, to another democracy, to a third, pleasure, “spiritual growth, integration of personality, self-realization, and so on.

This staggering question persistently confronts every person who attempts to live according to a

rational standard. He may not be always conscious of it, for in our ordinary affairs we have rough and ready rules, "lightning calculators," as it were, which relieve the strain on the judgment. But there are crises when these ready-made guides fail us. So it is with nations. The peace conference at Versailles found the world in chaos, in a state of flux. Things must be rearranged, organized once more to achieve the ends for which men live and strive. During the war the leading statesmen of the allied countries seemed very sure of themselves. They knew just what was wanted and how to get it. But when they came to the actual work there was confusion and difference of opinion at once. In the really difficult problems presented by Central Europe conditions have been made indefinitely worse than they were before the war. An attempt was made to satisfy everyone on the basis of democratic principles with the result that no one is satisfied. Democracy, self-determination were treated as if they were ends in themselves and not merely means to an end. What the people really wanted was a chance to live decently and in reasonable security. Today millions of them are starving, or on the verge of starvation, and war, despite the league of nations, is more or less imminent with practically every one of the newly founded states. The old monarchy at least prevented war among the various nationalities within

the empire and with the small nations lying on its frontiers. It was impossible to fix racial boundaries because the races are intermixed. The monarchy acted as a third party judge between the races. Today these races stand face to face with the old hostility intensified and without an intervening authority to keep them from flying at each other's throats. None of the new nations is satisfied with its boundaries and some of them have openly flouted the orders of the allies who created them. The Eastern boundary of Poland has not been fixed and one destructive war has already been fought on this account, and the French General Staff asserts that another is in preparation for the spring over this same boundary and that of Roumania.

It is the impression in America that President Wilson did not get what he wanted. I am inclined to think that he got very nearly what he wanted so far as the reorganization of Europe is concerned, and he got it not so much because of any power of coercion he possessed or because of convincing argument, but because his disintegrating policy coincided exactly with the interests and desires of Italy, France, and England. It has been the policy of France for hundreds of years to keep central Europe divided and chaotic. This is now also the policy of Italy and more or less of England also. It makes central Europe weak in a military sense. President

Wilson was, therefore, probably right when he said in his Boston speech that if we abandoned these new states they would not have a friend in the world.

And what an absurd and untenable position the allies have come to in trying to work with abstract principles! They have been compelled to deny Hungary the right to elect a Hapsburg as king and have gone as far as they dared to keep Greece from restoring Constantine to the throne. And, seeing the wretched mess, President Wilson has been led to declare repeatedly that our democratic allies are no longer democratic. His "New Freedom" contains strong hints that we have not true democracy even in the United States. Surely, the harassed student may be excused in exclaiming: "What, in Heaven's name, then, is democracy, and where may it be found?"

The whole unscientific, pacifist case has gone by the board. It was alleged that it was autocracy, monarchy, allied with financial privilege that made the war, and that the cure is democracy. And the end is that the chief sponsor for the theory, after having been given substantially what he asked for, finds himself reduced to denouncing all his associates in order to cover up the failure. "Europe is dying," wrote the well-known correspondent, Mr. Gibbs, in the summer of 1920. It is, and it is dying exactly where the democratic-pacifist combination worked its will unrestrained. It is dying where the direct

ravages of the war did not penetrate to any great extent, in the fertile and climatically favored valley of the Danube, in Bohemia and on the rich plains of Poland, dying because the political structure built up during a thousand years of historical development was torn down and cast away in the name of an ideal which has its value in its time and place but which is not necessarily universally applicable.

In two very important matters the conference frankly threw its guiding principle overboard. Through the league of nations the *status quo* as regards themselves, is mutually guaranteed, despite the fact that all the great powers are holding other peoples in forcible subjection. They had denounced their enemies for this practice and broken their empires in pieces in the name of liberty, but to guard their own possessions they agreed to confront the future crusader for "liberty and democracy" with the mailed fist, and called upon all the free nations of the world to come forward and underwrite this undertaking. The thing I am criticising is not the imperialism of England and the United States or any other country, but the hypocrisy of their professions. No small part of the present widespread cynicism is due to this theft of Heaven's livery during the war. I believe that the imperialism of England, France, and the United States is justified and that it is accomplishing much good, but it cannot be squared with the principles we have proclaimed.

If the democratic-pacifist merger wishes to gain the respect of the intellectually honest people of the world it must give better evidence of sincerity.

The same observations apply to the system of mandataries. They are absolutely in accord with common sense and science but utterly at variance with self-determination. The evolutionist would argue in support of this about as follows: These uncivilized and backward peoples are not utilizing their environment as fully as they ought. They are not transmuting it into life, not developing personalities as rapidly or as thoroughly as will be done under civilized control. It is, therefore, right that the latter should be given free access to this environment, this portion of the physical universe, in order that this process of creating ultimate values may proceed with as little obstruction as possible. In this lies, in fact, nearly the whole rational case of the militarists.

Up to this point we have been dealing with the primary struggle, the exploitation of the environment and how and why it leads to the secondary struggle or war. Is this consequence of the economic struggle, war, wholly bad, a horrible waste? The militarists and some scientists, probably a large majority of them, say that not only is it not a waste, but an unconditional necessity for progress. "War is a biological necessity of the first importance." It is a stimulant to invention and effort. Without it

we should lose ourselves in sloth and luxuries. War is a fiery test which destroys the weak and unfit and leaves the best to propagate their kind.

It would be flying in the face of evidence to deny that there is much truth in this theory as applied to the past or that much good comes out of war even under modern conditions. Nevertheless, on this point there is room for an honest difference of opinion. The real question is whether or not an effective and less costly substitute can be found. Is there a moral equivalent for war that can be made to work? The pacifist can in this case fairly allege that, since it is admitted that the primary struggle is pressed to the verge of starvation, there is here enough inducement for men to put forth every effort of which they are capable. To this the militarist can say no more than that war calls into being special emotions, motives peculiar to war, and valuable for progress. War has always forced co-operation and division of labor. At a time when the race had not yet made much progress in this direction much was learned in war. Under earlier conditions when greater isolation obtained, when social laws and customs permitted a wider latitude of action, the discipline required for successful war was greatly needed. A greater degree of standardization was at that time desirable. But today we fully understand the advantages of co-operation and division of labor. We now know the danger of laziness, idle-

ness and luxuries. We can take steps to guard against them if we can muster the self-control. The attainments of one people, new ideas, new methods, are made immediately available to all. The world works as a unit, economically. Industries interlock and go by schedule. There must be no lagging on the part of anyone, and a certain degree of efficiency must be acquired and maintained by the individual or the machine will cast him out. It is a discipline of both mind and body though not as severe and systematic as that obtained in military training. Moreover, a large portion of the population, the executive middle class, receives no physical training whatever. The physical training is confined to the laboring class, and even here a large part of the muscular exertion required in former times has now been eliminated through the use of machines. But at least we have the discipline, the instant response of the faculties whether mental or physical, a thing which did not exist under the old conditions of isolated efforts. Conditions are more fixed now and they in turn fix habits that make for survival. The enormous advantage of this is not as fully understood as it ought to be, especially in the training of children and young people of the adolescent age. I refer to the formation of habits, the establishment of automatic reactions that counteract the natural tendency toward dissipation of energy without producing useful results. The automatic response takes

the place of the weak will and sets the dreamer and the indolent man in motion in spite of himself. Summed up in a sentence, the modern business and industrial world enforces good habits so far as work is concerned, habits that make for survival, and provides for the eventual elimination of the unfit or unadaptable unless they are saved by charity. So far as war works for the extinction of the unfit individual there is not much to be said for it. It would be much cheaper to line them up and shoot them. In that way we should at least save the regrettable loss of so many of the best. War cannot be justified on the score of this negative result. The loss of this element of unfit and weak as a result of the strain of war is an incidental which, though unquestionably beneficial in a biological sense, we rightly strive to prevent as far as possible. It is entirely proper to mention this biological service of war as an accidental benefit received in a bad bargain. But when the militarist urges this as a positive reason for engaging in war he contradicts his fundamental thesis according to which war is justified on the ground of economic scarcity. If it is right to fight to prevent elimination through economic scarcity it cannot be right to increase that pressure to encourage even greater elimination.

The whole complex of ideas out of which the "biological necessity of war" is constructed seems to me to be rather jumbled. Loose and questionable

synthesis have been evolved out of equally loose analysis. In the first place, war is not primarily an affair between individuals but between collectivities or states. Its object is not to kill and to directly replace one individual with another. If that were the object the proper thing for the victor would be to exterminate the vanquished root and branch. War is a test of biological fitness only indirectly and is based on the assumption that this fitness is truthfully expressed through the power, wisdom, and efficiency of the state. The people biologically the fittest are those most adaptable. They are the most efficient in exploiting their environment both physical and social. The object of science, Professor Munsterberg once said, is to teach us what to expect of our environment. Since our ultimate source of strength is the physical universe, it follows that those people most efficient in exploitation are the strongest if they at the same time understand how to organize the component elements of this strength in the most effective way. If a state composed of such people comes into conflict with another not so efficient in these respects it will, if the terms of conflict are otherwise equal, conquer. Thus war is really a contest between different ways of exploitation in which the best method wins as a rule.⁷ The

⁷ Dr. Nasmyth slurs over this point by having recourse to the cheapest kind of debater's trick. On pp. 92 and 93 he says that the militarists, not being able to assert that war is the direct cause of progress when a "hundred thousand

point is easily perceived when the contest is between a civilized and an uncivilized people. It is very difficult to see when both are highly civilized. The league of nations is based on the assumption that there is not sufficient difference in the latter case to justify war. The system of mandataries implies that there is a sufficient difference between the civilized and uncivilized people to justify the former in holding dominion over the latter.

But it must be distinctly understood that conquest does not justify extermination. It should be used only as a means of breaking a monopoly not justified by the returns. Nor should the conquerors exploit the conquered but the resources which the latter have failed to exploit. Whether or not the conquerors assume a moral obligation to "uplift" the conquered may be a question of opinion. But

men lie upon the ground, some of them killed, the others groaning in agony," maintain that it is the preparation for war which refines the intelligence, etc., which causes progress. He answers: "This neglects the principal consideration, that everything depends on what the conqueror does after the victory. If he establishes a better set of institutions, it is the institutions, and not the battle, which causes the progress." He did not think it necessary to explain how the "victor" would ever have the opportunity to establish better institutions without having gained the victory. If he had referred to history at this point he would have found that as a matter of fact the victor usually possesses the better institutions and that it is this which, more than anything else, gives him the victory and justifies his conquest. This is the whole point and he covers it, Norman Angell fashion, with a coat of mud by using an irrelevant argument of the militarists who, in the instance he cites, have in mind the benefits of military training without reference to the effect of war upon a conquered people.

there is no ground in the moral law or elsewhere for depriving others of the fruits of their labor. To use force for such a purpose is destructive and destruction without adequate production is a crime in every sense of the word. Great confusion still exists on this point.

I am aware that the view of life presented here is rejected with scorn by those who style themselves idealists. It is grossly materialistic, they say. Man is not a mere puppet of circumstances. He is not inert in the presence of his environment. He has "always felt himself something more than a peripatetic chemical laboratory driven by the sex instinct." There are other wants beside the physical. "Discontent with existing conditions is the source of many of these wants, and discontent is something more than a hunger for bread and circus. . . . It is just as truly a spiritual hunger." "Economic determinism," is therefore, too narrow. It leaves out of consideration the spiritual values.⁸

⁸ See *The Spiritual Interpretation of History* by Shailer Mathews. Cambridge University Press, 1916. P. 64.

The pacifists and those who support the league of nations are rather given to posing as idealists and to charging their opponents with ungenerous and materialistic sentiments. This was one of the chief thoughts in the speech of President Wilson in Boston on his first return from Europe. Since then many others have followed the same line of argument, if argument it can be called. It is greatly to the credit of the American people, who at first favored the league, that they detected the weakness and perhaps also the unfairness and evasion of this argument. If the friends of the league had nothing better than this to urge their cause must indeed have been very weak.

There are still many objectors of this kind who, with supreme assurance, criticize a theory of the real meaning of which they have not the faintest inkling. Were I to answer a fool according to his folly I would say, "Yes, yes, of course. I understand we all do a lot of valiant strutting. We cannot be happy without our pose. But what are you yourself like away from the 'gallery'—in your underclothes, as it were?" The implications in such an answer would be unjust to the idealist but not more so than the idealists nearly always are in their characterizations of the realists.

To argue with objectors of this kind is really a waste of effort. The majority of them would probably withdraw their objections were they to study "economic determinism" until they understood it. The realistic evolutionist insists quite as firmly as does the idealist on the existence of spiritual values although he may not like the term because of its

This subject of economic determinism as opposed to idealism or the power of men to control their destiny, is a very large and fundamental one. The reader will hardly require explanation as to how pacifism is involved in it beyond what I have said in the text. Anyone who wishes a remarkably clear and convincing explanation of the "economic mechanism" should read Prof. T. N. Carver's "Essays in Social Justice," published by the Harvard University Press in 1915. He will here find a perfect illustration of how the theory of evolution should be used as a working hypothesis by a man who really understands it. In Prof. Carver's hands it is a living thing that permeates and illumines the actions of all living things. Prof. Mathews was acquainted with this work when he delivered his lectures at Harvard referred to above, but from the rather off-hand way in which he dismisses it I feel certain that he did not read it carefully enough to really understand it.

obsolete connotations. But he denies that these values can be enjoyed except as a result of, and by the means of the physical process, and that ideals which demand what is physically impossible have no value except a purely personal consumption value. We know life only as it is expressed through the physical body, and this body requires material nourishment besides many other things of a material nature. All, or nearly all, questions of justice and righteousness involve material values. They are the only values subject to monopoly or conflicting claims. There is no occasion to quarrel over spiritual values for they cannot be cornered or monopolised. They are unlimited and unconfined and cannot in themselves and unconnected with the material, be made the subject of action at law. In short, they offer no social problem. As a matter of fact we usually find that while the idealist is up near the clouds beating the air with his spiritual wings he is dangling a grappling hook for the flesh pots of earth which he is afraid to grab in what he calls the jungle fashion of the materialist. Thus Prof. Shailer Mathews, who affects to despise "bread and circus," when he comes to describe the true nature of "spiritual hunger," finds that it cannot be assuaged except by "bread and circus."

Without our spiritual aspirations life would be a bleak and dreary waste. But we can satisfy these aspirations only through a wise adjustment to our

physical environment. True idealism, then, does not despise the material necessities of those who are engaged in producing them. It will recognize the necessity of cutting our garment according to the cloth, that life is not only a matter of what we wish or will but also of what is possible. The thing to emphasize is not the perfect abstract ideal but the best that can be made out of imperfect materials.

Economic determinism as preached by Carl Marx may not be true. I am not defending *ex parte* interpretations of any kind but a view which the economist cannot disavow without pulling down the whole structure of his science. For, unless we grant that men's comings and goings are determined by their economic means the whole economic struggle becomes an irrational and wasteful squabble. Why should men who assert their independence of economic motives bother their heads about economic injustice, as they invariably do? It is economic scarcity that furnishes the basis for the theory of evolution, and economic needs must be satisfied in one way or other before anything else is possible.

To satisfy these needs the individual has liberty within limits. He may be content with much or little and he may usually choose one or more of many different ways to secure what he wants. But, taking the human race as a unit, this freedom is fixed in definite limits easily measured. Our margin of liberty, our index to freedom from environmental

restrictions, is the average rate of interest or margin of profit in industry. It is this which determines how the average man shall live. He may take his gains and use them as he chooses, wisely or unwisely, generously or ungenerously. Assuming that he gains more than his bare necessities, he may spend the surplus on culture or self-improvement or in increasing his productive capacity, give it away in charity, or spend it on harmful indulgences. But in any case the margin of gain over costs determines whether he shall walk, ride, or fly, whether he shall live in a depressing hovel or a beautiful and inspiring home, whether he shall possess few or many books and works of art, enjoy much or little music, and so on. His economic success determines whether or not he shall have the opportunity to develop and enjoy the spiritual values.

Surely it is nonsense to assert that according to this theory man is inert in the presence of his environment, or that it denies or belittles the spiritual values. An uncharitable critic might say that such opponents are merely raising a dust cloud under cover of which they seek to advance pleas which would be ruled out if introduced in the bright sunlight.

And when Prof. Mathews comes down to the always uncomfortable brass tacks he fails utterly to make good his contention. "It is as men taste the good things of life," he says, "that they particu-

larly realize the injustice of others' privileges, which, because hitherto regarded as inviolable, have become rights. And this induced feeling is certainly not to be identified with the desires for better economic conditions by which it is occasioned. It is just as truly a spiritual hunger." ⁹

This is supposed to clinch his argument against economic determinism. In reality it is but another testimonial to its truth. His sophism that the "induced feeling" is not identical with the "desires for better economic conditions" does not save him. It shows, however, that the "economic conditions" gave rise to both the "induced feeling" and the "desires," and that it is, therefore, the primary or determining fact, which is precisely what is meant by economic determinism.

The social student, whether he be liberal, democratic, socialist, pacifist, or reactionary, cannot get anywhere by re-introducing the disturbing element of the will as a free and unlimited factor in human conduct. Our hope does indeed, lie in the will, but only under condition that we recognize its limits of action. Is it not true that the discovery of these limits is one of the most important tasks of the social scientist? Our great and persistent difficulties are always located near the limit of our powers. If this were not so they would not be difficulties at all but merely the outcroppings of conscious perversity.

⁹ *The Spiritual Interpretation of History*, p. 64.

A completely undetermined being with an absolutely free will is a monstrosity. Such beings could not live together in a society at all, for they could not foresee each other's actions in the slightest degree and could, therefore, not depend upon each other. It is because our margin of variation is so small that we are able to live together with any degree of harmony. We are constantly pushing back the barriers that confine us and thus widening our field of action and as we do so we find it increasingly difficult to avoid getting in each other's way because the individual is not increasing his sense of responsibility as fast as his powers. And here, also, it is not so much a question of *willing* as of *knowing*.

VI

THE TWILIGHT OF THE MIDDLE CLASS

With the outbreak of the war a vague feeling arose that the whole of Western civilization had arrived face to face with a major crisis of which the war itself marked only the beginning. Many believed that the very existence of civilization was at stake, while here and there appeared the melancholy suggestion that perhaps Nature had come to the end of one more of her numerous experiments and was sweeping from her work-table a thing she had finally recognized as hopelessly bad. The human race, in short, had come to the end of its Book of Life and Nature had written *finis* at the bottom of the last page.¹ The questioning, dubious musings of Alfred Tennyson, struggling with grief over the loss of his friend, now found echo in the sober prose of science which, in its obscure outer gropings, had at last overtaken the imagination of the poet.

¹ Trotter, W. *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War*, Page 64, "Living as he (man) does in a world where outside of his own race no allowances are made for infirmity, and where figments, however beautiful, never become facts, it needs but little imagination to see how great are the probabilities that after all man will prove but one more of Nature's failures, ignominiously to be swept from her work-table to make room for another venture of her tireless curiosity and patience."

So careful of the type she seems,
 So careless of the single life.

* * *

"So careful of the type?" But no.
 From scarped cliff and quarried stone
 She cries, "A thousand types are gone:
 I care for nothing, all shall go."

This extravagant pessimism at the beginning of the war was confined to the liberals and pacifists while the conservatives, whether of the scholarly or layman class, anticipated no very radical or cataclysmic change. Speaking in a general way, the attitude of these two main groups has now been reversed. The optimists now are the liberals who may themselves be divided into two classes according to the ground upon which they base their optimism. We have, in the first place, the noisy gentlemen of the press and rostrum who suddenly came to life when our President sounded the war slogan and provided them with a mental fodder which has, with a few exceptions, excluded everything else from their diet and rendered their thinking completely sterile. They have staked everything on our war-cry of "Liberty and Democracy versus Autocracy." To them the overshadowing fact is the destruction of the Hohenzollern and Hapsburg dynasties, or monarchical government. Since in their minds neither liberty nor democracy, nor even justice, can exist under a government whose executive is called "king," "czar," or "emperor," the substitution of "presi-

dent" for these obnoxious titles is a thing of overwhelming importance. These exuberant people are sure that everything will now turn out as it should. If some of them are pulling a wry face over the situation in Russia and east central Europe, they nevertheless assure us that this is a purely temporary phase and that we may depend upon the people to find the right solution in the end.

Closely allied with this group are the pacifists of the popular type who are jubilant because there is to be a "League of Nations." They have no misgivings such as cloud the rejoicings of their more enlightened brothers of the faith. They are certain that permanent, universal peace is here at last. We can now furl our battle-flags for the last time, sink our warships in the sea and send our soldiers home to stay.

Lastly, there is a large and heterogeneous class ranging from doubt to a pronounced pessimism. They are the conservatives both in the intellectual and the economic or industrial field. The majority of the typical middle class or business men, belong here. Whatever the members of this group may think concerning the general question of war and peace, or the victory of the democratic nations, they are genuinely alarmed at what appears to them as a universal uprising against the whole present social order. But they are not as yet very clear in their own minds as to just what they mean by

the phrase "the present social order." They usually identify it with democracy which they seem to think synonymous with the rule of the majority. If the students of political science accept their responsibility they evidently have a monumental task before them. I cannot here enter into a discussion as to what democracy is or is not. I will, however, make clear by example the confusion existing in our minds which vitiates all our conclusions. We all with one voice, for instance, condemn the Bolsheviki in Russia because of their ruthless deeds and crude ideas. And that is well and good. But we immediately add that the Bolsheviki do not represent the majority. They are a wicked minority overriding the will of the people. Why this explanation? Would the actions and ideas of the Bolsheviki have been right had they represented the will of the majority? Does the mere fact that a thing is done by the majority make it democratic? In nearly all the popular discussions I have come across an affirmative answer is clearly suggested. I hope that in the course of this discussion it will become clear that the problem is much more difficult than we have assumed.

The general reversal of position noted above was brought about through America's entrance into the war. The pacifists, until the last moment frantically opposing war, could not foresee their good fortune. To them war is the sum of all that is evil. It is the exercise of might and might cannot

make right. Much could come out of it but certainly nothing that is good in the sight of Heaven. What they anticipated most generally was a tightening of the forces of reaction resulting in a new grip of capitalism upon the throat of labor. That was, in fact, the chief motive for the violent denunciation of the war by all liberals and radicals everywhere. It seemed to them to retard indefinitely their hopes of a final settlement with the common enemy. They had, moreover, been deeply wounded in their pride. For, had they not asserted for years that labor, socialism, social democracy had made war impossible? They were beside themselves with rage and disappointment when they saw their confident prediction so completely shattered and the supposed international solidarity of their adherents exposed as a myth. The world was pointing an accusing finger in their direction and it was necessary to do something about it if their whole cause was not to be brought into contempt. A scapegoat must be found at all costs; and in this search they were more fortunate than they could have hoped to be. If it could be shown that the war had been wilfully provoked, that there was no real conflict of national interests, the cause of pacifism was not lost but might be indefinitely strengthened as a result of the war. But America was at first not inclined to concede that much. We had read too much about the slow concentration of Europe into

two hostile groups to be readily persuaded that the war was a mere accident or due to some perverse individual or group of individuals. We still distinguished between the occasion and the cause of the war. We must have proofs.

And these proofs, or what we took to be such, Germany very obligingly furnished before the war had proceeded very far. Her utter contempt for all moral considerations, her unheard-of brutalities, her repudiation of her own solemnly pledged word of honor, made it easy to conclude that she had no cause for quarrel in the first place. But she did not even stop there. Already believing herself victorious and all-powerful, she added to her terrorist methods wholesale disregard for the rights of neutrals, not hesitating long, when it suited her purpose, to kill their people on the high seas where the universal usage of nations gave them the right to be secure in their persons. And as if this were not enough her scholars and publicists began to call openly for world dominion. She had, in fact, appealed bluntly and literally to the morals of the wolf pack.

The world could not permit these things to go unchallenged. Nor was it to be anticipated that when the gauntlet was picked up the speech of the respondent would be a scientifically exact statement of his cause. Such statements rarely touch upon

the real things at issue.² They are not made to convince the intellect but to arouse the fighting blood. For this purpose nothing is more effective than an appeal to ancient and deeply ingrained shibboleths. If these can be identified with new grievances and made to serve the prevailing trend of the popular mind, the reaction is instantaneous and powerful, though it may not be unanimous. It was these considerations of political expediency, not those of logical and historical accuracy, which gave us our war cry as formulated by President Wilson. Consistency is always thrown to the winds if inconsistency will serve our purpose better. Thus, until we entered the war our official position seemed to imply that the parties at strife were fighting about nothing in particular, certainly nothing vital. In December, 1916, we proposed a "peace without victory"; that is a peace which settled nothing except the war. That was the original pacifist position—"there is nothing to fight over." That may or may not have been repugnant to our peace-loving Presi-

² It is quite true that The President did enumerate the infringements of our rights in the first part of his address to Congress calling for war against Germany. But this part of his address was completely overshadowed by the generalities which followed. Everybody, including the President, soon forgot about our neutral rights or our duty to uphold international law. In fact, some pacifist newspapers openly repudiated the idea that German aggression against ourselves or the integrity of international law could be urged as justification of our action.

dent, but it was certainly difficult to pass from this to a convincing declaration of war based on specific grievances unless we elected to recur to the infringements of our neutral rights, and our pacifists could not be made to support the war if this alone were made the issue. To secure the support of all, or nearly all our people, some slogan must be sounded that would appeal to the pacifists and at the same time not repel any large number of others. What better than to raise the ancient cry of our people against despotism and combine it with the obscure but long-lived dogma of democracy that monarchies alone are warlike? But this program was not complete without the "League of Nations." With that added we could fight not only to "make the world safe for democracy," but to put an end to war forever. This convinced all but a few scholars and a handful of extreme pacifists that such a war would be a good war. It was an unexpected piece of good fortune for the pacifists. Having just been thrown into despair over the renewal of the war spirit and the temporary increase of national hatreds, and hopeless of securing for a long time any general agreement among the peoples of the world, this definite official sanction of the league to enforce peace assuredly came as a flash of light in a dark night. Discredited pacifism had received for its spokesman the president of one of the most powerful nations in the world.

It must be admitted, then, that President Wilson's war addresses made good "politics." But I believe it can now be shown that this was an extremely high price to pay for American unity, or to put it more definitely, to secure the support of the pacifists for the war. The issues have been hopelessly obscured and muddled. The matter of democracy is clearly irrelevant, and had it not been it was still bad policy to begin a world-wide crusade for our political ideals. Democracy is as militaristic as monarchy, as all history shows, but it has never shown at a worse advantage than when seeking to impose its own forms of government upon another people. For that is what our ultimatum amounted to. To say nothing about the fact that democracies grow but cannot be made out of whole cloth, the attempt to dictate to other people in this matter is radically at variance with the very liberty democracy so loudly proclaims. This cannot be done with impunity. It will necessarily react unfavorably upon ourselves. We officially declared the crimes of which we complained to be personal with the members of the government. The people were expressly exonerated. This distinction was, as everyone knows, entirely mythical, but once made we should have stuck to it and confined ourselves to the demand for the surrender of the designated criminals without making any suggestion whatever as to who should take their places. If the people were in fact innocent and forced into

war and a generally militaristic attitude, we could have counted on them to choose new men for their leaders who would follow a peaceful course. This would have been entirely logical and in accord with precedents. We should have avoided the formal charge of hypocrisy, inconsistency and double dealing to which we have fairly laid ourselves open. As it now stands we have answered a crusade of autocracy against democracy with a crusade of democracy against autocracy.³ So we are all tarred with the same stick. Moreover, we have declared the German people innocent of wrong but propose to make them pay for the ravages of the war. All this could have been avoided had we merely stated the simple, literal truth. That would have damned German aggression more effectively than volumes of vague rhetoric about political theories could possibly do. We should then have been without reproach today and entirely free to insist on any settlement that now seems good and fair to us.

³This is our way of putting it. I doubt if Germany cared much about the forms of government upheld by the people of the countries she attacked. Her motive was economic. We have as justification the fact that we resisted aggression. The fact that the aggressive government was monarchical in form was a mere accident. We should have resisted no less had Germany been a republic. We have here another good illustration of the law of imitation formulated by Prof. Tarde. Germany makes war and announces her intention to conquer the world, to establish German "kultur." We reply with an equally sweeping proclamation setting forth our mission to free the world—that is, establish republican forms of government.

But that is only part of the mischief wrought by our attempt to wage war on pacifist principles. We actually appealed to the German socialists to turn traitors to their own country by declaring that we were fighting their battles. We invited them to join us and thereby called their principles good. With the social unrest everyone knew to exist in Europe this was an extremely reckless thing to do. It was the strength of the German government chiefly that held this unrest in check and to break that government down completely does not appeal to me as good statesmanship. We can see the consequences well enough today. The threat of "bolshevism" would seem much more remote were the German government still firmly in the hands of an hereditary ruler or the representatives of the middle class. As it actually is liberty, as we now understand it, seems near the precipice throughout Europe and not very sure of its future even in America. Europe east of the Rhine is today largely in the hands of the socialists and tending, it would seem toward bolshevism, or the tyranny of the laboring classes. How large the margin of safety is in France and England no one knows.

What, then, did we mean by liberty and democracy? Clearly, we can have meant nothing except the principle of *laissez faire* embodied in one form or other in all the constitutions based on the political philosophy of the eighteenth century from

which these constitutions emanated. The bills of rights in these constitutions are designed to give the individual the greatest possible opportunity for personal development consistent with the general welfare. They form the basis of the competitive system which is, in modified form, the counterpart of "natural selection" through the "struggle for survival" in the plant and animal world. It may be a mere accident that the political philosophy out of which this system grew is sometimes called the "natural rights" theory, but if so, it was a happy accident.

This system of *laissez faire* had before the war become the basis of all the governments of the Western world. The individual guaranties were in various forms and degrees, recognized in the basic laws of all these countries, including Germany and Austria.

Now, let the reader observe that these practical guaranties were, in the main, unchallenged by any of the existing governments whether monarchical or republican in form. For the old struggle against absolutism from above was over and done with. The natural rights philosophy had definitely won the day. Slowly and painfully elaborated during the eighteenth century as a system of absolute rights to set over against the absolute rights of the monarchy based on historic fact, it had constituted a perfect wrecking-tool when used against the latter,

and had at the same time evolved a group of shibboleths to which the public mind instantly responded. But the individual guaranties of which we have spoken merely represented an expedient no matter how absolutely they might be stated. Ultimate right was declared to rest in the people. *Vox populi vox Dei* was tacitly accepted as literally true. Nothing less would have constituted a logically complete answer to the absolute monarchy.

Taking these things into consideration, what would be the intuitive or subconscious reaction to the old war cry of the eighteenth century? At first sight it would seem that it should lead to a renewed respect for, and belief in, the existing political institutions. If the old menace of absolute monarchy had still existed this would undoubtedly have been the effect. But there was very little dissatisfaction with monarchy in Europe. There was practically none in Germany. The German Emperor was, in fact, more popular in Germany than was President Wilson in America. Not even the Russians had any pronounced grudge against their Czar. The passion of the opposition was everywhere directed against the middle and upper classes and the kind of government they stood for. The world had moved on a long stage and we talked as if we had still been in the eighteenth century. The threatened revolt at the time we entered the war was a revolt against the middle class system, the middle class constitu-

tions whose individual guaranties stood in the way of the opposition. The whole competitive system was the object of attack because it had prevented the levelling process desired by those who conceived themselves as having suffered from the liberty of our free institutions. These men did not want either democracy or liberty. They wanted class government, or at least class legislation of a radical kind. Into this situation we plumped our direct appeal to the unorganized German people, specifically, the socialists (for they alone at this time were in any sense in opposition to the government) to assert their sovereignty. True, that did not necessarily imply that they must do away with the competitive system in favor of socialism. But logic counts for little in such conjunctures. The shibboleth is applied in accordance with the prevailing motive of the time. The same language, the same appeal that produced the French Revolution of 1789 and its conservative constitution of 1791, also produced the terror which flouted almost every principle contained in this constitution. What we did was, in effect, to join hands with the German socialists to overthrow the existing government which, under a monarchical form, rested upon the middle class without whose support it could not stand. That could not fail to give a powerful impetus to the whole socialistic movement not only in Germany but all over the world. That it actually did so we now see in the

political alignment in this country where the whole radical labor movement, the wing with socialistic leanings, is solidly behind the President either because they feel that he is with them or because they think they can push their interests under cover of his program, and on no subject is this attitude so pronounced as on the league of nations, or the socialist principle applied to international affairs. On the other hand and supporting the construction I am putting on events, we have the conservative Senate in violent opposition to the whole presidential program. Liberal men like Senators Johnson of California and Borah of Idaho cannot be accused of stand-patism or of being swayed by narrow class interests. They are men whose general political ideas do not vary greatly from those of President Wilson himself. They love peace, but they are worried and express their worry in opposition to the league of nations. Throughout the war they seemed in full accord with the administration. Why, then, have they taken such sudden alarm as their language now indicates? The veteran Senator Lodge, last representative of our enlightened, refined and dignified statesmen of the old school, saturated with our unspoiled democracy of a former period, also has given expression to his uneasiness. Lastly, and most significant of all, the late Col. Roosevelt, the most pronounced exponent of our type of liberty, attacked the whole administrative

program as soon as it became evident that the war had been won. Was this another instinctive or intuitive reaction on the part of a natural adherent of the existing system? No man in our history has understood human nature better than did Mr. Roosevelt. He seemed to be able to foretell without effort just how the average man would react to a given appeal. Times without number he did and said things which would have wrecked the political career of any other man and not only escaped with impunity but received roars of applause in the bargain. If any other man touched one of our major prejudices that was the end of him politically. When Mr. Roosevelt did so, gave us a good whipping, we betrayed no resentment but instead shouted, "Do it again, Colonel. Do it again." Yet this man whose common sense, practical insight and patriotism no one ever doubted, died with the gravest misgivings as to the outcome of the grandiose scheme we have undertaken.

And if we may believe the few and incomplete reports we receive of what is going on at the peace conference, the attitude of the European statesmen is not much different.⁴ They seem to feel that our

⁴On January 31, 1919, a French observer, an independent student of politics who never allows his judgment to be warped by popular clamor, wrote me as follows: "Actuellement, le vrai Dictateur est Wilson, votre Président des Présidents. En Angleterre, m'écrit un Professeur d'université belge, on l'a en grippe. Aux États Unis, vous me dites qu'il agace l'opinion. (I had written him of the resentment felt at Presi-

President is playing an extremely dangerous game. The French, more than any other people, have reason to distrust the language which they themselves made the common property of Western civilization a hundred and twenty-five years ago. They know how inflammatory it is and what unexpected results it sometimes produces. Wild talk is now spreading in Paris to the effect that President Wilson is "the greatest advocate of Bolshevism in the world." That does not mean that any honest man doubts his sincerity, his high motives or his democracy. No one can fail to admire his high purpose and courage. But that is not at all the question. The question is: What use will the malcontents make of the situation he is helping to create?

And yet the major thesis of President Wilson is undoubtedly the right one. The world is sick and needs treatment. We must assume a liberal attitude and arrive at some kind of compromise with the forces of discontent for to attempt repression pure and simple will have only one result—revolution,

dent Wilson's statement before the last election asking the people to return only Democrats to Congress.) En Italie on se moque de lui. En France on s'en méfie. Mais partout on a peur de lui, parcequ'il est une force. Il a dit aux hommes ce que les hommes voulaient qu'on leur dise—savoir qu'il leur apportait la paix finale, décisive."

That is to say, the popular audiences of the President applauded his speeches on universal peace and the league of nations while the French statesmen distrusted his policy. And reports received from England and Italy by the writer of the letter, indicated about the same situation in those countries.

world-wide and inconceivably destructive. But that is a matter of practical detail, not one of general theory. To again open the question of theory by speaking the language from which any theory whatsoever may be deduced is, in effect, to use the language of discontent become universal since the great upheaval at the close of the eighteenth century. Why, the Bolshevik himself went to France for his instruction. The men who taught him drew their inspiration from the literature of the French revolution, and the Bolsheviks today are using its jargon without having the least notion as to what it means to the rest of the world. While consciously trying to follow in the footsteps of their French teachers they denounce the governments of Europe and America as middle class tyrannies. It is this fact, I believe, which is causing the uneasiness I have spoken of but which has not yet found clear logical expression.

Let us now try to discover what there is in the Wilsonian program itself and aside from the language with which it is defended, that could give some justification for these fears. The first and most prominent item is the League of Nations. It has, in fact, a close connection with the class struggle and the whole movement for the overthrow of the middle class or capitalistic system. In the first place, its establishment is a direct confession of the weakness of competition or the competitive idea. By adopting it we concede that nations cannot be

trusted to decide wisely for themselves. The individual nation confesses to a certain degree of moral cowardice, to a distrust of its own worth, and its unwillingness to make the sacrifices necessary to uphold its ideals. In theory it surrenders completely to the idea that wisdom and righteousness are innate in all men whether black, yellow, white, or copper colored and that they in no way depend upon education or the degree of civilization. The intuitionist or transcendental school of ethics, not the evolutionary school, is given the right of way. That is a logical necessity and the natural consequence of the general idea of the federationists. For the essential of the evolutionary principle is differentiation and selection. It is a philosophy of growth and change. The intuitionist cannot allow either differentiation or selection for he goes back to a super-induced morality. His moral sanctions come from "above," from outside the evolutionary process. It is absolute and unmotivated, uninfluenced by environment, while the evolutionist holds that life itself, as far as we can know it, is nothing except the interaction between the unknowable Ego and its environment. The difference is fundamental and ineradicable. If the socialist has the wit and if he will take the necessary pains, he will find that he must either accept the theological dogma of intuition or abandon his socialism as a working hypothesis. But I shall not stop here to show why that is a logical necessity to

socialism. I will merely say that the body of scientists accept the utilitarian or evolutionary ethics and reject the other as outside the field of science altogether.

We do not yet know just what form the League of Nations will assume at its inception. The ultimate aim of those who most strongly favor it is a "United States of the World," with legislative as well as executive powers. That would be the logical fulfilment of the program. Such a league has often been compared with our own federation of states and their amalgamation into a national state with constantly growing powers. What would be the effect of such a league upon the history and welfare of our own country? The first and most obvious effect would be to involve us definitely and permanently in all the quarrels of Europe and Asia where our strength could be exerted with the least advantage. Our foreign policy would be controlled by an international council or legislature in which our voice would be pitted against the overwhelming vote of Europe and Asia which, as old and overcrowded lands, would have economic interest conflicting with ours. The whole Western Hemisphere contains only about 155,000,000 people against the 400,000,000 of Europe and the 900,000,000 of Asia and the East Indies. It would be the natural thing for such a council to insist that America must admit freely immigrants from all the overcrowded portions of

Europe like Germany and Italy, for instance, where the birth rate is still high. The assurance of protection under such a league would give an immense stimulus to such immigration. The pressure from Japan, China, and India would be much greater still. We might object to this but our objections would make only a feeble impression once it is assumed, as under the league it is assumed, that nationality must not stand in the way of justice as commonly understood. We could not deny that these countries are in need of room and that we have room to spare as compared with them. Having entered a close world brotherhood we should be acting the part of a dog in the manger if we selfishly reserved our resources for our own future development while hundreds of millions of our brothers are on the verge of starvation.

Does this seem far-fetched? If so we need only to remember that overpopulation and the consequent difficulty of keeping up the standard of living is perhaps the most common cause of war though it may not consciously appear on the surface. It was certainly the chief cause of the war just ended. We do not admit it now, but there is little doubt that the leading motive of Germany in bringing on the war was her conviction that she had reached the limit of her resources. Her phrase, a "place in the sun," was full of meaning to her. The economic law of diminishing returns had become operative

long before the war and the wages of unskilled labor had sunk below a living scale. Mr. Gerard reports that men worked for as little as thirty-five cents per day. These men could not be anything but a burden to themselves and a menace to their fellows, and that through no fault of their own or any one else in particular. Such conditions always appear sooner or later in every country where the birth rate is excessive and where no conscious restraint is exercised. That may not excuse war but it helps to explain it. Men with empty stomachs, if they see no way of filling them, are liable to become somewhat indifferent to the moral law. In fact it is difficult to explain the aggressive attitude of Germany for a period of two thousand years except on this theory. The great German migrations began a hundred years before the Christian era and continued for about seven hundred years. Tribe after tribe left their homes and spread over the Roman empire where they were either exterminated or forced to settle down. Not until the Franks in France and the Lombards in Italy developed into powerful states capable of checking further migrations was the movement finally arrested, and even after that millions of Germans left Germany singly or in families. Great colonies now exist in almost every land, local centers of Germanism which gave rise to the more threatening phase of Pan-Germanism. We do not want any more of them today, but

we may be forced to accept them under the league if it ever becomes as strong as its advocates wish it to be.

With regard to Asiatics we are not left to conjecture as to what will be expected of us as a member of the league. We have now a "gentlemen's agreement" with Japan on the subject of immigration. We adopted this temporary *modus vivendi* because Japanese public opinion is very sensitive on the matter and we could not agree to any permanent solution Japan would accept. This proves sufficiently how acute the situation is, and we may, therefore, be very certain that Japan would press her claims under the league. Indeed we had a hint the other day as to what the Japanese are thinking to-day on this point. An Associated Press despatch dated London, Dec. 11, 1918, reads: "Dean Inge of St. Paul's Cathedral, speaking at a meeting here of the British-Italian league, recounted a conversation he had the other day with an intelligent Japanese about the league of nations. The Japanese asked the dean if he thought the league would succeed. 'I don't know,' the latter replied, 'but I think we should try it.' Then, Dean Inge went on to relate, he said: 'We Japanese consider that we are highly civilized, yet if we want to go out as colonists to the United States or Australia we are prevented from doing so by laws. I want to ask whether if we consent to disarm these disabilities will be re-

moved or not?' I was obliged to say, 'I am afraid not. That is a workingman's question and as long as the Japanese workingman gives better value for his wages than the European or American or Australian, they will shrink from no violence to keep you out.' To that the Japanese replied: 'Well, then, why should we disarm and join a league of nations?' "

It is clear enough, then, what some Japanese hope to secure from the league of nations. To them it is worth nothing except as a means to gain entrance to America or Australia. The dean was wrong, of course, in assuming that our only objection to the Japanese is his high efficiency or low wages. The laborite does not want him because he does not want any outside competition at all. The people in general object to the Orientals because we do not want another race question. Our experience with the negroes has made us wary on that subject. Considered still more broadly, we do not want, from now on, any large immigration from any source whatever because it would tax our resources and lower our standard of living. Our land question is already becoming acute, and is the cause of considerable unrest among the agricultural population. Landlordism is under vigorous attack today and demands are being made for discriminatory taxation against lands held for speculation. Landowners have

reached the position of virtual monopoly and the high price of land is becoming a serious problem.

If the immigration question should arise in the league, and it would be certain to arise in the end, we should be outvoted if the representation is on the equitable basis, that is the democratic basis, of relative population, for all the densely populated countries would vote against us; and some others might do so in order to avoid trouble near their own doors. For, should we be forced to receive an unlimited number of immigrants from Europe and Asia the pressure there would be relieved.

Another vital objection to a close league is the difference in development politically and socially of the various countries of the world. England and America have a long tradition of self-government and special standards of morality. But we should be compelled to submit to the decisions of the league in all questions in which it is recognized as competent. Our greater experience might be of service to others but we should have no way of guarding our own standards indefinitely. Nature works largely through selection, and as already suggested, the league would make this impossible, or at least greatly interfere with the process. Our various nationalities are the product of selection made possible by what the eugenist would call "isolation." But the principle of isolation is as vital in sociology as

in biology. A variate among the social institutions, too, must have elbow room to escape dwarfing or total strangulation. Not all variates are good, and too great a number of them, whether good or bad in themselves, cannot be tolerated because they disrupt organization. Just where the line must be drawn is a matter of doubt and opinion. As in most other matters of principle there is an absurdity on either end so that the only practical course is to stay somewhere near the middle.

But I hear someone object that this is merely dealing with hypotheses; that when we come to apply this reasoning to the world as it is no contingencies such as here contemplated would actually arise. Well, let us take an example. No one, for instance, will dispute the assertion that we Americans are extraordinarily proud of our women. Nothing will arouse our wrath quicker and get our coats off than an insult or injury to one of them. I will make it even stronger and say that we do not discriminate very closely. She need not be an American woman at all to bring us into a fight. Had our President willed it so he could have made the execution of Edith Cavell the occasion for our break with Germany and our soldiers would have fought as ferociously and with as good a conscience as they did for the vague abstractions they were told officially to defend. Show us that a certain policy will result in lowering the position of the American woman, or

endanger the superlative virtues we ascribe to her, and we shall make short work of the business. Well, what about the position of woman in Asiatic countries? A woman in Asia is a beast of burden in the first instance and the source of pleasure of the men in the second. She is, indeed, so poor a thing that she is regarded in some places as not possessed of a "soul," whatever that may mean to the Oriental. In China her infant daughter is often taken out and killed or left to die from exposure. Shall we throw our ideals into a sort of jackpot with things of this kind? That is certainly what our action would amount to were we to permit a multitude of people with such ideas and practices to be unloaded on our shores. Today the world is dominated by Western civilization. That is, we have the power to enforce our will and are, in fact, generally recognized as leading the world, as is shown by imitation of us everywhere. But if we reject this power and voluntarily subject our decisions and policies to review and possible reversal by the rest of the world, civilization will certainly lose by it. We cannot mix with the East and not lose by it. It was Kipling, I think, who said: "The East is East, the West is West, and ne'er the twain shall meet." This may or may not be poetry, but it is truth at least in one sense: they can never meet on equal terms. For if the plastic European with his high nervous tension mingles with the stolid unchanging Asiatic in full

brotherhood, it will be the European not the Asiatic who will give way. Personally I feel no repugnance toward the Japanese, for instance. I have had some dealings with Japanese laborers and I have nothing whatever against them. I have found them neither obsequious nor cantankerous, and least of all, vulgar; which is more than I can say for some others I have had the misfortune to employ. They understand their rights and will insist on them, but they will never, so far as my experience goes, injure their employer's interests out of revenge for fancied wrongs. I have never seen them underbid American labor. They are quite capable of taking care of themselves and will drive as close a bargain as their American competitors. So far as I can see the Japanese people are wrong in thinking that Americans look down on them. On the contrary, Americans regard them as in every way "good sports," which is about the highest compliment we ever bestow out here in the West. But this does not remove the principal objection we have to Japanese immigration, namely, race mixture and the increase in economic pressure, or scarcity.

I must remind the reader that I am here urging objections against the ideal of the federationists. A league of nations of a less thorough-going sort, one that simply provides greater international co-operation, is another matter. I admit that in practice nothing very cataclysmic is likely to take place. Changes would in any case come about gradually,

but they would not be the less certain or disastrous on that account. I admit further, concede it with a good deal of satisfaction, that no responsible statesman of today is dreaming of a "United States of the World" with sovereign power of legislation so directly affecting the internal social structure in every country of the world. But even a league that seriously interferes with our independent action in international affairs would lead to radical internal changes. These changes might, without undue stretch of the imagination, be conceived to go so far as to upset our national constitution and make the United States a highly centralized state somewhat after the model of France, except that the executive instead of the legislature would wield the power.

The thoughtless person scoffs at this fear. He points to similar fears during our early history on the part of people who took alarm over the possibilities in the new and untried constitution. It was a silly fear, he says, because nothing sinister happened. He is entirely tranquil. The dangers must be more obvious, he says, before we need take alarm. The answer to that is very simple and conclusive to any one who has taken the pains to discover how great historic changes of this kind usually come about. For when a danger becomes very obvious and apparent to everyone it ceases to be a danger at all in matters in which there is a conscious choice, because we immediately take steps to meet it. The league of nations is dangerous precisely because the

dangers are not obvious; because we discover these dangers only after a more or less involved process of reasoning. Moreover, a half dozen or more interlocking propagandas are at work determined to see the program through no matter what the consequences may be. Perhaps it would be better to say that many of these propagandists desire the league because they are seeking to bring about the very things some of us fear. Strong sentimental, financial and party interests are backing it and burying us under an avalanche of demagogery in which a rational voice cannot make itself heard. This was not true in case of the adoption of our constitution. People did see very clearly then that the federal constitution would probably destroy local self-government unless the states remained jealous and vigilant. The first hundred years of our independent history are very eloquent on this subject. The federal government could not usurp authority because the people were ready to fight the moment such a thing should be undertaken. But so good a student of constitutional history as Prof. Burgess seems to think that the things our ancestors feared may still come about. He is of opinion that America may wake up some day to find itself in the hands of a Cæsar, and he gives some rather strong reasons in support of his opinion.⁵ This is the way he read

⁵ *The Reconciliation of Government with Liberty*. Pp. 373 and 382.

the signs four or five years ago. It would be interesting to know what he thinks of them today!

It is apparent from our discussion up to this point that the league of nations is, through the question of immigration, closely involved in the universal class struggle, and therefore necessarily also in internal politics. But the interested parties are not yet clear in their own minds as to just how they will be affected. Much will depend upon the powers conferred upon the league by its constitution in its final shape. A strong league with large legislative powers capable of dealing authoritatively with the interests out of which wars arise, that is a league empowered to eliminate the basic causes of war, would be a ready instrument in the hands of Europe and Asia with which to pry open our monopoly of relatively undeveloped resources and thus force down the standard of living to a common level throughout the world. On the other hand, a weak league, one designed solely as a mechanical device for immortalizing the *status quo*, would be to our advantage in this one matter of defending our natural resources. For, under such a league the guaranty of our Monroe doctrine resting on our own strength alone, and more or less dreaded by the other nations of the Western Hemisphere, would be replaced by the stronger guaranty of the league. We want nothing of Europe and Asia in the shape of territory or right of immigration. All we want is the "open

door," or the right of free and unrestricted exchange, since, generally speaking, conditions are such that our people would not go there for exploitation.

It would appear, then, that American labor ought to support a weak league and oppose a strong one, and that American capital, if it is short-sighted enough, will favor a strong league and oppose a weak one.⁶ For immigration, by making labor plentiful, puts it at a disadvantage in bargaining with capital. Given plenty of immigrants, capital can buy labor at its own price. Here also enters the good old American game of "boost" which has always been so successful in bedeviling all questions

⁶ Carver, T. N. *Essays in Social Justice*. Page 260. "Another class which must be put alongside the socialist leader as an enemy to the laboring classes includes all those who advocate a large supply of cheap labor as a means to industrial expansion. A certain narrow-minded, short-sighted type of capitalist who confuses the public interest with his own immediate and temporary profit, says that we must have large numbers of low-wage laborers in order that his particular enterprises may succeed and flourish. He does not seem to realize that large numbers of low-wage laborers mean large numbers of people living on very small incomes, and that this means widespread poverty. Few of these men are so crude as to discourage the laboring classes from trying to rise through thrift, economy and foresight; and they are, therefore, less venomous enemies of the laboring classes than are the socialists. But they strenuously oppose any measures or policy which will otherwise reduce the numbers of laborers who are looking for jobs. If the socialists' effort to keep the laborers down can be defeated, and laborers and the children of laborers can be encouraged by sound teaching to rise into property-owning and employing classes, this tendency alone would thin out the ranks of unskilled labor and make it scarcer and harder to find, were it not counteracted by a rapid increase of the supply from new sources."

These sources, says Prof. Carver, are immigration from Europe and a high birth rate at home.

of local interest. The real estate speculator, the retail merchant, the chambers of commerce, will cling to their delusion until the stars go out. They will, therefore, demand ever more people because the more people the more business. It will be a long time yet before the merchant, all legitimate business, in fact, perceive that this form of "boosting" is in the long run harmful to all except the real estate speculator, who is very little more than a social parasite. So, while the league of nations is getting under way and growing, we may expect "business" and capital to favor the league because it will certainly encourage immigration even if it is not formally forced upon us. Closer contact and an increased sense of security alone will bring this about. All the pacifists of whatever school will, of course, press for a steady increase in the power of the league to handle all questions whatsoever.

The league, from this point of view, is a menace to American labor. And it is not likely that the clear-headed laborites, such as the executive officers of the American Federation of Labor, have any illusions on this point. They are willing to help their European brothers in the common fight against capital, but they are not prepared to share jobs with them. This is proved by the action of Mr. Frank Morrison, secretary of the American Federation of Labor, in going before Congress with the demand that all immigration be excluded for the next four

years. But the attitude of the socialists and radical wing of labor is different. They are virtually committed to the Bolshevik program of class rule and the destruction of the right to private property. Secretary Wilson of the United States Department of Labor told a congressional commission the other day that on the Pacific coast about thirty percent of union labor had taken the Bolshevik attitude. The socialists, as Prof. Carver has shown,⁷ do not want labor to prosper, because prosperous labor has nothing to gain from socialism or class rule. Labor must be kept discontented and poor, and the best means to this end is a large immigration either from "heaven" or from other countries. They will, therefore, fight for every species of pacifism, for the international jackpot. That is the only way in which they can bring about in America the conditions now existing in Europe. The closer the contact with Europe the easier it is to impregnate American labor with the doctrines of European labor, namely, socialism.

I said a few pages back that the league of nations may ultimately upset our constitution and give us a highly centralized government at the expense of local autonomy. That appears at first sight as rather a wild statement. And yet the tendency toward this result can be easily demonstrated. This will come chiefly through the treaty making powers

⁷ *Essays in Social Justice*. Pp. 258-259.

of the President and his virtually absolute control of foreign affairs.⁸ Under the league the business and importance of this department will grow enormously. The obligations we accept under the league will necessarily have to be discharged through the executive. These duties will stand on the same footing as those accepted under ordinary treaties which our constitution declares to be the "supreme law of the land." These may be very far-reaching. Even under the confessedly embryonic constitution of the league just submitted they apply to the whole field of labor legislation, treatment of labor, a number of industries connected with war munitions and armaments, tariffs, and right of transit, international arbitration in which any subject whatsoever may be involved. If we accept this our constitution must be trimmed to comply with whatever the league determines under its constitution, unless we repudiate our obligations or secede from the league. And all this falls to the executive. The Senate cannot interfere effectively no matter what its formal rights may be under the constitution. If any one doubts this let him observe what has been going on for the last two months and what is now about to take place. Our President went to the Peace Congress snubbing the Senate at the very start. Neither the Senate nor the

⁸ President Wilson himself is authority for this construction of the treaty making power under our constitution. See his *Constitutional Government in the United States*. Pp. 77-78.

people at large know what has been going on behind the locked doors at Versailles. The constitution for the league of nations will be presented to the Senate and the Senate will accept it without making any radical changes. The peace treaties will go through the same process. In France and England the executive is a mere figurehead. The executive duties are discharged through responsible ministries themselves the creatures of the parliamentary majority with its direct mandate from the people. Our President has no mandate whatever in the modern sense of the term. He is not supposed to be bound by the platform of the party through which he comes into power. He represents the whole people; that is to say, no one, for the people as a whole have no will in a political sense, because whatever its will may be it cannot be expressed. The political will of the people is the will of the majority, or perhaps, even only of a plurality. The President is, therefore, at liberty to do as he pleases so far as any formal mandate is concerned. In France and England any member of parliament may "interpolate" the premier and demand an accounting on any subject whatsoever. If the premier cannot satisfy the majority a vote of lack of confidence forces the whole ministry out of office. No such power rests with our Congress. The majority may storm and threaten to its heart's content, and the President and his Cabinet may, and frequently do, go cheerfully on their way. Such is

actually the situation today with regard to the Senate and the President's foreign policy. The Senate is, in fact, helpless. It possesses the formal authority to reject the league of nations and the peace treaties to follow, but cannot exercise this authority because of the nature of the subject. To act effectively it would require the power to intervene in the negotiations while they are in progress. Under the league of nations this situation of the Senate will become progressively worse. The President's power will grow with the increased importance of our foreign relations. All the administrative details of the league's work, all its legislative acts, so far as they affect us, come under the control of the President. When hereafter he comes before the Senate he will speak not only as President but as the local representative of the league with all its prestige behind him. Moreover, for some time to come he will have ready to hand the whole socialist and pacifist propaganda to laud and uphold him in every step he may take in carrying out the policy of internationalism for which the league exists. Our President will, therefore, have a greater incentive than ever to indulge in the reprehensible practice of touring the country in order to back his program with the irresponsible chatter created by this maneuver instead of guiding himself by the more sober and reflected verdict at the polls. From this it is not so very far to "Cæsar and his mob," against

which Prof. Burgess, after a full and careful study, warns us.⁹

⁹ Since Prof. Burgess has been recognized for many years as one of our foremost authorities on political science and constitutional law, a somewhat long quotation from his work will, I hope, be acceptable. On page 373 of the work we have named he says: "We have just the qualities to answer the call of a Napoleon in the Presidency. And now that the government has free hand with the purse-strings of the rich, without being compelled to consult them in the slightest degree as to the amount it will take and as to the purpose to which it shall be applied, and since Congress has become a body rather for approving the plans and deeds of the President than for controlling him and for legislating independently, it is possibly only a question of time when our Napoleon will appear and take advantage of these opportunities; at least, it would only be natural that he should and it is to be apprehended that he will."

"The events of these sixteen years since 1898 have brought about a serious readjustment of the relation of government to liberty in our political system, and that to the advantage of government at the cost of liberty."

Page 380. "A school of Sociologists and Political Economists arose, who, impatient of the voluntary methods of religion, charity, and philanthropy, have sought to accomplish social justice, the social uplift, by governmental force. There is no question that they have exercised a strong influence in directing the thought of the present, and that they have taught the politicians that there is no vote-catcher in a system of universal suffrage comparable to the promise of forcing those who have to divide with those who have not or have less. The Jingo and the Social Reformer have gotten together and have formed a political party, which threatened to capture the government and use it for the realization of their programme of Cæsaristic paternalism."

Page 381. "A government standing over all classes in the Society and independent of them all, might be trusted to say how far force can be safely employed in requiring sacrifices from one class to another, but a changing, shifting Government, a Government representing the property class, or the propertyless class, especially a Government representing the propertyless or small-property class, a Government representing the modern democracy under universal suffrage, a Government representing the class to be benefited by the confiscation and redistribution of wealth through governmental force,

In view of this exceptional position of our President, it is obvious that our European allies can enter the league of nations with much less risk to themselves than we are forced to assume. For they cannot be irrevocably committed by a single man with powers much greater than is possessed by any other executive in the world. They are in position to interfere at any moment a too idealistic or too ambitious minister undertakes a policy which threatens their interest or independence. The stronger the league grows the more certain will they be to restrict and supervise the actions of their executives. With us the stronger the league becomes the more hopeless will be the position of the Senate and the nearer we shall approach a limited monarchy with independent powers of legislation in the hands of the monarch. The cry for a league of nations in the name of democracy would, therefore, appear humorous were we in a mood to appreciate humor on such a subject. But such a result never follows as long as the people remain capable of self-govern-

cannot be safely trusted with any such power. It would become a temporary despotism, which would destroy property, use up accumulated wealth, make enterprise impossible, discourage intelligence and thrift, encourage idleness and sloth, and pauperize and barbarize the whole people."

Page 382. "The history of that (political) development shows beyond question or cavil that a Republic with unlimited Government cannot stand, that a Republic which makes Government the arbiter of business, is of all forms of state the most universally corrupt, and that a Republic which undertakes to do its cultural work through governmental force, is of all forms of state the most demoralizing."

ment. The sinister thing is that such a thing is assumed necessary by our President and that it is approved by so large a number of people. It is a confession of weakness a republic cannot afford to make lightly.

The book of Prof. Burgess to which I have already several times referred bears the suggestive title: "The Reconciliation of Government with Liberty." That is exactly what we are concerned with in the present essay. He found that our national constitution with its amendments at the close of the Civil War offered the most perfect reconciliation as yet effected in any instrument of government. He discovered the very essence of liberty in the guaranty of individual immunities in the bills of rights embodying the principle of individual initiative, competition, or, in the language of evolution, the struggle for survival as relating to selection and the survival of the fittest. But he discovered also that we seem to be growing tired of this liberty, this real democracy. He found that a school of sociologists, closely allied with a certain class of social welfare workers, has undermined the stern sentiments upon which these guaranties rest. A weak sentimentalism is arising which cannot tolerate the sacrifices our liberty demands and, therefore, clamors for amendments and legislation which shall wipe out these fundamental restrictions on government; that is to say, wipe out the very thing we have always regarded

as liberty and democracy. Here again we meet our pacifist friends. The very essence of pacifism, of the league of nations, of socialism, of the demand for class legislation, is this revolt against this idea of struggle. And in order to befuddle our thinking beyond hope of recovery, the whole body of malcontents have seized upon President Wilson's crusading word of "Democracy" and made it their own. The child is to be drowned in its mother's milk.

Our constitutional guaranties are already broken in one vital particular. The income tax amendment places property in the shape of income at the absolute disposal of Congress. As far as the law is concerned, the power of total confiscation is admitted. The first income tax law was not oppressive in severity. It was, however, despotic in its discriminatory character. But we have progressed during the six years since its adoption. The Nonpartisan League now calls for the total confiscation of all incomes and inheritances above one hundred thousand dollars, and a Washington labor assembly recently passed a resolution demanding drastic taxation of large fortunes until all are reduced to a common level. How long will it be before the Nonpartisan League will lower its limit to ten thousand dollars,¹⁰ or before the whole left wing of labor fol-

¹⁰ Since the Nonpartisan League has been for some time very much in the public eye, since it has been accused of disloyalty, sedition, Bolshevism, etc., and many of its organizers and officers mobbed, imprisoned and generally perse-

lows the Washington demand? For, if the government takes all incomes and inheritances above one

cuted, I find it necessary to explain myself more fully lest I be misunderstood. Being myself a member of it I am naturally in position to know what it is and what it demands. It is guilty of none of the things it is charged with, as is sufficiently proved by the fact that no charge has so far been made to stick in court. It is, however, closely allied in some states with the radical wing of labor in which there are certainly many who advocate the Bolshevist methods. But the League definitely repudiates these methods and its membership has no sympathy with them whatever. It has a program of local legislation much of which is excellent and approved by conservative economists. Among the things advocated is a mild form of single tax, state owned mills and elevators, state crop insurance, state bank, and other things along this line. But these institutions will have to live in competition with private concerns in the same lines, since they must pay their own way. And as will be seen, they are all of such a nature as not to involve directly any great number of individuals. It is an experiment worth trying since it does not commit us very far and is not likely to be very expensive.

The resolutions to which I have referred in the text were passed by the national executive committee of the League last December, without sanction from the membership. These same resolutions also called upon the government to retain control of all public utilities taken over during the war. There is little doubt that many members approve this action and it is not likely that it will be formally disapproved.

This matter belongs in our discussion also for another reason. The *National Nonpartisan Leader*, official organ for the League, and the various state organs, are pacifist to the core. The *National Leader* calls for "A united States of the World" in the shape of a league of nations. It repeats all the familiar pacifist arguments and binds them into the class struggle. The resolution to confiscate incomes and inheritance above one hundred thousand dollars is justified on the ground that such fortunes are the result of "war profiteering." The reader is left with the suggestion that all "Big Business," to use the *Leader's* favorite term, is guilty of robbing the people while at the same time conspiring to keep alive the war tradition. In short, all the unfair assumptions, all the nonsense about "munition makers," etc., so familiar in pacifist literature a few years ago, finds echo in the *Leader*. This seems all the more remarkable since the farmers and the League movement

hundred thousand dollars we may be very certain that before long no incomes will rise above that figure. Then, having become accustomed to this form of largess, the cry will go up to lower the limit. An enormous amount of capital will be withdrawn from production and consumed, since it has no profit in it. Men will be thrown out of work and labor will be worse off than before. Thus the pressure from below will increase with every new extortion from capital. All this certainly endangers our "present social system."

I have seen the New Democracy, the Wilsonian democracy, defined by some of its supporters as a new ideal in which is recognized the "duty of everyone to contribute to society in proportion to his means as well as in proportion to benefits received." If this is true, and I rather think it is, we have the evidence for our thesis summarized for us, for the new ideal is so close to the socialist principle as to be nearly one with it. The New Democracy advocates exactly the same thing as the Washington labor

have nothing whatever to do with the question of peace and war. Their real legislative program is local, each state having its own particular list of planks. It shows once more how pacifism inevitably manages to get into everything having to do with class interests.

The danger in the Nonpartisan movement lies not in its legislative program but in these other general matters put forward by the leaders which may very well disrupt the League some day, in which event a certain number of its members will go with the leaders and their socialistic and pacifist program.

assembly—progressive taxation on large fortunes until all are on a common level. Social justice under this plan frankly rejects the idea that everyone is entitled to the rewards of his labors. It insists that the hard-working efficient individual must contribute to the support of the slothful and inefficient, and that the latter is to receive this contribution not as a matter of charity, but as a right, as something justly due him. Under this system the avowed purpose is to increase steadily the sphere of governmental interference in matters which have hitherto been regarded as private. This calls for increased taxes and these taxes will be levied on those ablest to bear them. The greatest objection to this method is not that it is unjust but that it pauperizes so large a proportion of our people. It destroys our self-respect, our sense of duty, and when these are gone we are ready for any proposal the most vicious demagogue may be prepared to make.

Here again I must call the reader's attention to the fact that the chief ingredient, the chief ferment, is the central idea of pacifism. It is the abrogation of the principle of evolution according to which the individual is justified by his works. There is to be no elimination even of the milder sort in which the inefficient and lazy suffer from their faults merely in being compelled to live with fewer enjoyments than are possible to their successful brothers. Success is to be penalized and failure, whatever the

cause, is to be rewarded. Curiously enough, the watchword of the New Democracy is "service." Still the same shifty method of presentation! The word has so broad a meaning that it means nothing in particular. No one denies that every one must do some service to be entitled to rights. Used so broadly it describes nothing new. It is used in this way in order to create the presumption that those who oppose the New Democracy do not believe in service, whereas the difference lies in different conceptions of service. The economist's idea of service is conscientious production of useful commodities. The general view of the evolutionist makes out of service any act or suggestion that enables us to adjust ourselves more perfectly to our environment. In the New Democracy the word service means "largess," unqualified and enforced, if necessary. This was the whole thought in the address of President Wilson at Boston, in which he justified the league of nations. He asked America to dedicate herself to the task of helping the world regardless of costs to herself. He hardly so much as asked the question as to whether or not the league would actually afford this help. How it might affect ourselves, whether or not it would result in the complete wreck of our own institutions and thus render us incapable of giving any help whatsoever, did not enter into the discussion. And yet that was the only question demanding discussion since there is no difference of

opinion on the general desirability of service. Not a helpful word did we get on the practical difficulties. Summed up, the address meant: It is a good thing to do good. But it hardly required any argument to convince us of that.

Now, all this may be democracy; but if so, it is no relative—not even a distant one—of the democracy to which we have been accustomed; the democracy which produced the fine body of crusaders of which we all in common with our President, are so proud. Neither is it liberty, and least of all, justice. It is, in fact, the exact opposite of all this. The tendencies I have described in this essay have little in common with our past. The things now demanded cannot be granted in the name of our ancient ideals. The appeal must be made to other principles than those which have hitherto guided us. Not until we understand that clearly shall we understand what is really asked of us now. The system under which we are living is accused of favoritism because some men have prospered under it while others have not. But it is the only system the world has yet devised which has consciously and passionately repudiated every kind of privilege. It recognized no class distinctions and has, therefore, compelled every man to stand squarely on his own feet, to live or perish according to his merits. It has come to be called the middle class system because the middle class formulated, proclaimed and maintained it. It

has harbored some abuses. These, I believe, could have been remedied. But we have not the patience for that, it seems. The middle class itself has lost confidence in its work. That is a confession of weakness nature never pardons. The middle class was a natural, not a legal product. Since it repudiates the natural law upon which its existence depends in favor of an artificial system in which men are made or unmade by law, the "Twilight of the Middle Class" may be said to be approaching, if it is not already here.

VII

ALTRUISM, JUSTICE, AND THE STRUGGLE FOR SURVIVAL

I have shown elsewhere that the necessity for struggle, both in the primary and secondary sense is caused by economic scarcity. From the primary struggle there is no conceivable escape as long as human beings must have food, clothing, and shelter. But this primary struggle with the environment leads to the secondary struggle, or the conflict direct between man and man. Is this also absolutely inevitable? I am afraid that upon this point some writers have not made themselves as clear as they ought to have done to avoid misunderstanding. They have not always distinguished sharply between that which is logically possible and that which is, as things now stand, a practical certainty. As long as the motives which now dominate mankind retain their relative force conflict is inevitable. But need these motives necessarily retain their present relative force? If the answer is in the affirmative, then we surrender the belief in the inherent power of mankind to influence its destiny in any way. Whatever change for good or ill it may undergo must be conceived as coming from without. This is what the idealists

accuse the evolutionists of preaching. The misunderstanding arises from the fact that the evolutionist, finding human motives so nearly constant, has not thought it necessary to positively make the saving qualification upon which rests our sole hope for better things.

But even after this saving qualification is made we must distinguish between latent and active conflict. The latent conflict is as irremovable as the primary struggle with the environment. So long as individual consumption remains a necessity so long will this latent conflict endure. It is today crystallized in the institution of private property which rests, in the last analysis, on rival claims. For no one would take the trouble to establish a monopoly in anything if no one else wanted it or if he could secure a substitute from an unlimited supply. Nor would the partial or entire abolition of private property as demanded by the socialists and communists respectively, remove this conflict. It would merely change its form. The necessity for consumption would remain the same. Only the method of distribution would be changed.

With active conflict, such as war, it is entirely different. War is a method of forcible distribution whether the object be finished goods or natural resources. If the motive behind peace is strong enough, so strong as to overcome all others, we can snap shut our jaws with an emphatic "No!" and make

good. That is the peace-at-any-price attitude. The simple fact that wars occur is the conclusive proof that the dominant motive for peace does not yet exist. As things actually are occasions still arise when we prefer war to peace. To say that we make war against our will is evident nonsense, for it amounts to saying that we will and do not will at one and the same time. When we go to war we have, subconsciously at least, weighed the cost of war against the cost of abstaining from war and have made our decision accordingly. We may have weighed the values wrongly and consequently made a foolish decision. But that is neither here nor there. The decision is the best we were capable of making at the time. To say that we could have decided otherwise than we did is to imply that human conduct is an accident, the most pessimistic conclusion of all. For, if human decisions are accidental we can never in the slightest degree foresee them or in any way count on them. This irresponsibility of the will would render mutual understanding, and therefore co-operation as well, impossible. Such a philosophy, akin to a certain type of idealism, if it is not the very essence of it, destroys every basis upon which any reform whatsoever could be founded.

To avoid war, then, we must either change our estimate of the values involved in going to war or so change our conduct as to prevent these values from ever being placed in the scales. That is to say,

instead of permitting things to drift until our estimate of values spells war, we must interfere farther back in the course of events and so order things that the juxtaposition of values will never call for war. The present pacifist movement is directed mainly toward a change in our estimate of values when matters have drifted near the breaking point. My belief is that the better hope lies in a readjustment of values farther back. If we continue working during the day as we have been doing we shall always have about the same things to show in the evening. We must change the "day's work." I mean the day's work of the individual rather than that of the nation. For as long as the individual continues doing what he is now doing the conduct of the nation to which he belongs is not likely to change much. The conflicts of national policies that lead to war are not accidental. They arise automatically out of the aggregate activities of the individuals.

In what way does individual conduct bring about conditions leading to war? First and fundamentally, by excessive procreation, as already pointed out. Injustice, extreme selfishness, destructive, as distinguished from productive competition, unscrupulousness in business, all tend toward social unrest and irritableness or a state of mind amenable to the war psychology. Laziness on the one hand and the demand for unproductive consumption of lux-

uries on the other, work toward the same end. Labor and capital spent in luxuries could be employed in the development of more balanced and efficient individuals, a work which is at present in an embryonic stage. This covers not only the whole field of formal education, but much else that must be left to the individual after he has left the schools, and which he now neglects through ignorance, weak will, or lack of opportunity due to the absorption of his time and energy in acquiring the bare necessities of life. I am not urging a narrow asceticism. The question of luxuries must be looked at in a common-sense way. To sacrifice everything to the production of mere animal necessities is to miss the very object of production, which is nothing but the fullest possible development of the "spiritual values" already discussed, the harmonious growth of personality. To minister to this end much more than the bare necessities is required. But hundreds of millions of dollars are annually wasted in this country in vulgar ostentation, to gratify whims, vanity, personal eccentricity or depraved tastes. It may be difficult in any given case to locate accurately the line between good and bad consumption, but the principle is plain enough. Many of our wealthiest men have clearly perceived the moral responsibility devolving upon them in this matter and have racked their minds to discover a way to spend the wealth they could not rightfully use for their own personal

gratification. They have set a fine example which it is to be hoped will, some day, become more nearly universal among men of their class. Is it too much to expect that some day they will work out a practicable scheme by which they can, without injury to the stimulant of competition, exercise a self-restraint that will avoid the accumulation of wealth they do not want, but a share of which thousands of others could use to excellent advantage? It is true that this wealth remains for the most part as active capital engaged in further production, but it is also true that much of it goes to sustain a large number of people in idleness who would be much better off if they were engaged in some serious occupation. Such a scheme would work greatly for social peace, individual welfare, and indirectly for international peace. Self-restraint in pressing economic advantage is a good general rule, and if it were more generally observed would obviate the necessity of a large part of the enervating charity which is at present a necessity.

There is, therefore, a grain of truth in the pacifists' belief that "capital" has something to do with war, but it is too distorted and exaggerated to be of any service to us. This is true even of their view of the capitalists seeking investments and concessions in foreign lands. The sins of these capitalists are rarely as black as they are painted, and even if they were, they would share their guilt with their

countrymen who profit from these operations. At this moment a pacifist president is engaged in a violent controversy with England over oil land concessions in Mesopotamia and South America. This is in spite of the fact that the Lloyd George ministry is professedly pacifist and is administering the Mesopotamian district as a mandatory under the league of nations and under rules which are supposed to guarantee equal rights to all nations. So far has this controversy gone that the other day a member of the British Foreign office declared that England and the United States are "drifting into the path of war." Evidently, then, the merits of such cases are sometimes hard to determine, which is to say that, as a rule, neither party to such conflicts is seeking anything to which it feels it has not a good title.

To sum up this point, the pacifist is wrong in fixing the blame for international friction upon a class. The guilt comes back to all of us irrespective of the class to which we belong. It results from the general struggle in the face of the environment, not from the struggle of any class. The international conflict is a continuation of the conflict between individuals. To modify or eliminate the former we must modify or eliminate the latter. I have enumerated some of the more important things which intensify the conflict between individuals. Is it possible to formulate a general theory for the establishment of

complete harmony? We have had a number of suggestions along this line among which the theory of the socialists and communists are best known. Occasionally also a scientist has ventured to express a belief that eventually a way to peace would be discovered. In his "Principles of Sociology" Herbert Spencer wrote: "The ultimate man will be one whose private requirements coincide with public ones. He will be that manner of man who, in spontaneously fulfilling his own nature, incidentally performs the function of a social unit and is yet only enabled so to fulfil his own nature by all others doing the like."

Professor Carver gives a theoretical consent to this view, but adds that the condition visualized is "a long way off." He grants that there may be a few people who have no preferences; who love all mankind with equal fervor. If we could develop or breed a race composed exclusively of such individuals we should eliminate conflict, he thinks, and establish a universal communism based on a perfect altruism.

Mr. W. Trotter in "Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War" comes to the conclusion that we must adopt this way out if the whole race is not to perish. Altruism, he says, is a product of the herd instinct with a tremendous pressure back of it, but which herd instinct itself seeks to suppress with savage vindictiveness. Nevertheless, altruism persists and is visibly growing. Pacifism, despite its

appearance of "crankiness," is an altruistic movement and as such is to be welcomed. It has been smothered, he says, by "Leader-lunged" pseudo-scientists with their facile doctrines of degeneracy, the pragmatic lecturings on national characteristics, on Teutons and Celts, on Latins and Slavs, and all the other ethnological conceits with which the ignorant have gulled the innocent so long."

Altruism, Mr. Trotter argues further, has labored under the disadvantage of being regarded as of extra-human origin, as something breathed into man from an external source. As such it has been represented as a weakness because it interferes with nature's law of "tooth and claw." But this is a wrong way of approaching altruism, for it is as much a part of the evolutionary development of man as anything else in his make-up. It has, therefore, as good a standing with the scientist as the law of "tooth and claw." It is the voice of Nature herself crying out against her own brutality. It does not conflict with anything essential to our development because we have arrived at the stage of rational choice. We must rise above the force of blind instinct, take this hint and proceed henceforth on lines consciously chosen so as to avoid the waste occasioned by our present incoherent methods according to which we are forever working at cross-purposes and dissipating a large part of our energies in fighting with one another and destroying

much of what we all have an interest in preserving.

And there is no logical difficulty in the way of this conscious progress. It demands a high degree of specialization in the individual somewhat after the pattern of the different cells of a living organism. The cells of a living body have surrendered their independence and subjected themselves to the performance of particular functions assigned to the different organs of the body. There is no waste here because there is perfect co-ordination of effort determined by the central nerve organ, the brain. In the society of the honey bee we have an example which very nearly approaches this perfect co-ordination due to an absolute altruism in which all the aspirations of the individual seem merged in service to the hive. "The extent to which the hive makes use of the powers of its individuals," says Mr. Trotter, "is the measure of the completeness with which the social habit is developed in it. The worker bee has practically no activities which are not devoted to the hive, and yet she goes about her ceaseless tasks in a way that never fails to impress the observer with its exuberant energy and even its appearance of joyfulness. It is thought that the average worker bee *works herself to death* in about two months. That is a fact which can scarcely fail to arouse, even in the least imaginative, at any rate a moment of profound contemplation." In fact, so close is the co-operation of the hive that it presents the appear-

ance of a single animal when a swarm of bees is in flight, and the single bee "is almost as helpless as a part of the naked flesh of an animal detached from its body."

Mr. Trotter does not say it in so many words, but the reader, nevertheless, receives the impression that he regrets our inability to imitate the bee. This, he remarks, is difficult if not impossible, because of our greater capacity for assimilating experiences due to our enormously greater mental powers. The bee can co-operate so perfectly because she is deaf to all voices coming to her from outside the hive.

This presentation of the advantages of co-operation, or communism, is interesting because, unlike all others I have come across, it is founded on a natural impulse—altruism. Man will sooner or later arrive at the point where he will find his happiness in service to society and the suppression of all those myriad individual impulses which now make such conduct impossible. He will set himself to work deliberately to eradicate from his nature even the desire to be anything for himself, but to live and have his being in the herd alone and without a look beyond. Like the worker bee, each individual will find his task assigned to him, and will then, with an unprecedented cheerfulness, grind out his life without thought of himself. He will be merely a part of a great machine with no will of his own and no desire to do anything which may in the least inter-

fere with his allotted task. In such a society there can be no conflict, Mr. Trotter leaves it to be inferred, though he does not say so directly. He does not even definitely outline this society as I have done. I am drawing the conclusion which necessarily follows from his analysis of conditions as he pictures them in his example of the honey bee.

In his conception of altruism as a natural impulse, Mr. Trotter brings the discussion fully into the scientific field and thus permits us to ignore the man who spins the whole external world out of his inner conscience with its infallible monitor on all moral questions. But he largely destroys the value of this conception when he assumes that this altruism is an imperative command from a personified nature and that it must displace completely other instincts in conflict with it. This assumption is not necessary for the fact of conflict in the various tendencies of evolutionary development cannot possibly be taken to imply that one or other of these tendencies must necessarily come to dominate and finally destroy all others. If there is any "intention" in Nature it is clearly that of "checks and balances." Without that the whole conception of evolution is impossible. It is much more reasonable to suppose that altruism, as well as all the other internal or mental conflicts, serve merely to check tendencies which, if permitted to run their courses unchecked, would completely derange the balance and produce a lop-sided develop-

ment. But this correction made, we may say that he has scored a point against the extreme biological militarists in showing that in the human species, at least, the law of "tooth and claw" has a powerful counter firmly based in nature itself.

On the other hand, his choice of the honey bee as an example of a society in which altruism has completely eliminated conflict, is unfortunate. For, despite its extraordinary mechanism which seems expressly designed for this purpose, conflict in the bee world is hardly less disastrous than in other species, although it is of a different nature. The bee does not escape the law of economic scarcity. Nature has furnished her with raw materials out of all proportion to her needs, but her method of exploitation is so imperfect that the danger of starvation compels her to resort to the most ruthless process of elimination. As if to avoid overpopulation, the bee has specialized in sex. The swarm is composed of one fertile female, the queen, and a small number of males, the drones. All the rest, the workers, are neuter. In breeding, the workers, by a special feeding process, rear a number of drones and queens, but the first of these queens to emerge from her cell immediately breaks open all the other queen cells and cruelly stings their occupants to death. If this were not done the swarm would multiply so fast as to make subsistence impossible. So like-

wise, after the "nuptial flight" of the queen attended by the drones, the latter are exterminated by the worker bees if food becomes short. But in spite of these precautions the swarm increases in numbers and a portion of them, accompanied by the old queen, is forced to emigrate, or swarm, in search of a new home. This is, among domesticated bees at least, often a tragedy of enormous proportions, because large numbers of them perish and sometimes the whole swarm is disrupted and ceases to exist as an independent society.

And yet Mr. Trotter is right in saying that the example of the honey bee should give us a "moment of profound contemplation." For here is a species of God's humble creatures struggling with its limitations and problems much as we are doing with our own. From whatever protoplasmic cell they may have descended they have now reached a stage beyond which, so far as we can see, they may hope for nothing. Somewhere in the lost ages of their history they made their choice of a mechanism for the elimination of conflict and it has turned their lives into unchanging cycles. By manipulating the sex instinct they have apparently assured a uniformity of reaction that will make further variation extremely difficult. They have secured perfect co-operation at the expense of those wayward impulses of the individual which are the source of new dis-

coveries and progress. Turning their backs upon the external universe, they must seek in their own little world all that life can give them.

This, needless to say, is an anthropomorphic view of the case of the honey bee. I have resorted to it merely to illustrate an idea I could not have made equally clear in any other way. For, all through the history of our race, the sex instinct looms red and sinister. It is metamorphosed and disguised in a thousand ways, but in one form or other dominates our emotions and directly or indirectly enters into the majority of the motives which underlie our activities. It is responsible for a large share of the good and evil in the world, is the source for many of our joys and finest aspirations, griefs and tragedies. It was in this light that the author of Genesis conceived it in his story of the Garden of Eden and our first parents, and the modern scientist, whether moral philosopher, physician, economist, or sociologist, is fast coming to see it in the same light. Here, then, it would seem, is the strategic point at which to begin operations for the betterment of society. Here is a leverage found nowhere else. It is true that this very fact imposes extreme caution and forbids any action not based on the clearest conception of what is desired, and reasonable certainty the action taken will bring the results sought. But if we always refuse to act because there is much

chance for harm as well as for good, our efforts must necessarily remain comparatively futile.

But before following this clue to the end we must have a clear definition of altruism and its relation to right and justice. If we look upon altruism as a sentiment which induces one person to surrender his rights to another, it is evident that it conflicts with justice. It will be seen, moreover, that altruism of this extreme or direct type can never become universal because it would be a logical impossibility for it to find expression. *A* might wish to surrender his rights to *B*, but if *B* were actuated by the same sentiment he could not deprive *A* of his rights by accepting them as a gift. As long as individual consumption remains a necessity nothing could be gained by this method beyond a more perfect distribution. It would leave the basic difficulty of scarcity untouched. Justice would still have to step in to apportion goods according to merit in production. In certain immaterial goods, such as works of art, for instance, where "consumption" does not "consume," and perhaps, in the enjoyment of an opera or play, a certain degree of altruism could be practised without infringement of justice and the idea of altruism itself. But it is apparent that this practice applies to international affairs only by way of exception. There are certain courtesies which nations extend to each other and minor services which they perform free of charge. In this very

matter of works of art there is no national selfishness. The state-owned galleries are usually open to every one without entrance fees, irrespective of nationality. The works in these galleries represent a large expense and it costs something to keep them up and police them. The archives, libraries, and museums generally are opened in the same way. This fact ought to convey a hint to those who assume that international strife is due to pure human "cussedness" and not to a real conflict of interests. To me this suggests that people prefer to help each other if only they could see their way clear to do so. The generous feeling exists, but the conditions of life do not permit us to let it have its way.

No sentiment or social mechanism can remove this basic conflict. Not even the extreme communism of the bee escapes it. In case of a bad season for the collection of honey, a large swarm might find its food sufficient to bring through the winter, let us say, only ninety percent of its number. Should the food be equally distributed all would perish. Or should the queen be starved to the point of unfitness the swarm would probably become extinct the following season. To save itself the hive would be forced to resort to elimination.

We are, therefore, forced to recognize the other side of altruism, that is to say, sacrifice. As long as it remains sentiment, altruism is futile. When it

is put into practice it becomes sacrifice. Sacrifice may be either voluntary or enforced. When it is enforced it becomes social injustice. At this point the pacifists and militarists have a nice opportunity for argument. For it is easily seen that an enforced sacrifice may sometimes be right, so that justice and right part company at this point. The bee hive that could save only ninety per cent of its members would be right to sacrifice the other ten per cent, because if it did not do so there would be a loss of one hundred percent. So, if a lifeboat were overcrowded and sure to sink unless some of its occupants voluntarily jumped into the sea, it would be unjust to throw anyone overboard, but it would nevertheless be right to do so. As a matter of sentiment pure and simple, we should applaud if such a measure were not resorted to, but sentiment and common sense are radically at odds in this case.

The existence of the altruistic sentiment, then, is not enough to condemn war. Sacrifice is still necessary and the militarist argues that that is precisely what war is, the sacrifice of a small number for the good of the rest. Our soldiers in France, so President Wilson tells us, felt that they were sacrificing themselves for the good of mankind. Very much the same feeling existed, I believe, among the French and English. The German soldier was sure that he was offering his life for the good of the German race through which he felt all mankind would ulti-

mately be benefited. All may have been mistaken, but they were none the less truly altruistic. Nor is there in this anything more repugnant to our moral sense than there is in the contemplation of millions of isolated individuals who are giving their lives inch by inch through half a century or more in order to relieve the grey monotony and misery in the lives of others. Indeed, the latter case seems to me by far the more pathetic. The matter of emotional repugnance is, therefore, irrelevant. If war, and conflict generally, get us on our way faster, give us more life than we could secure by abstaining from them, then they have a good moral sanction. If they do not, if we perceive a practical course that will give us the same results with less sacrifice, then war and conflict are wrong.

And there is a way of avoiding a good many of our troubles, a way which has been often pointed out by students of the social sciences, but which the pacifists with characteristic perversity refuse to consider. It has not been chosen by the propagandists, I suppose, because no political capital can be made out of it nor huge royalties collected on the publication of sensational books and articles appealing directly to class prejudices. That extreme economic scarcity has its origin in the sex instinct through its relation to procreation has long been a scientific commonplace. But why, then, is no intelligent and concerted effort made to direct and control this

instinct? Primarily because there is no immediate profit in it, and also because capitalists and speculators desire a large number of people whose immediate necessities place them in the way of easy exploitation. It is as if there were a universal conspiracy to prevent this truth from becoming generally known. No statesman, so far as I know, has ever dared to discuss this subject frankly and fully. The few private individuals who have had the courage to urge birth control publicly have been denounced as cranks or criminals and threatened with imprisonment. Birth control is an established practice in the educated and well-to-do classes, that is, where it is least needed and least desirable. But this sign of intelligence has not brought rejoicing. It has instead provoked a grave shaking of heads. It is regarded as an evidence of decadence. Some time ago wise patriots expressed alarm over what they called the unwillingness of educated women to bear children. The thing was so terrifying to some people that they seemed to have some doubt as to the wisdom of sending our women to the colleges and universities. The horrible indictment was, fortunately, not sustained in the court of evidence. The alarm was caused by the discovery that the homes of educated women do not usually swarm with offspring after the fashion of poultry yards. A few college graduates were, indeed, convicted of failure to marry. These vile creatures, "social parasites,"

some call them, I believe, evidently had a conscience in the matter and thought it out for themselves. Since it would hardly do to assume that any man or woman is totally without the mating instinct, we must infer that these women concluded, after a dispassionate weighing of pros and cons, that their duties did not lie in the direction of marriage and motherhood. They deserve the highest civic crown for braving popular disapproval and for calling attention to our grossly immoral practice of flinging millions of children into the world blindly and haphazardly. The cattleman who overstocks his pasture and produces a herd of runts is called a fool. The statesman who advocates the same thing for the human race is a wise man, a man after God's own heart. And yet we complain that life is held so cheap. But what else can we expect? Has not the cattleman with his runts cheap cattle? We talk of rendering dignity to labor. The trouble is not with labor, but with the laborer who has no dignity and who can never secure it as long as he is compelled to fight with his brother laborer for a job the returns of which would not keep a thoroughbred horse in comfort. Shut out the flood of immigrants and teach the American laborer to rear a small family which he can educate and keep decently, and the dignity of labor will soon take care of itself. But this is the very thing the pacifist internationalist is determined to prevent and the militarist is only too glad

to encourage him in this attitude. To admit that immigration may be a bad thing for a country is to admit that there are conflicting interests, an admission which would destroy the case of the internationalist. But the greater the number of people the greater the number of fighting men. Hence the militarist favors a rapidly growing population.

But this is not all that stands in the way of a rational conception. "Development" and "boosting" are two words which have a fascination for Americans. Since the Pilgrims landed in New England we have struggled westward over a wilderness three thousand miles wide. On the frontier life was always hard and dangerous. More people were needed here, and as they arrived those already on the ground received a large reward for their daring and hardships. A tradition has been growing for centuries that the faster the population grows the better. But the frontier disappeared two decades ago. The conditions are now radically different. Natural resources have become a monopoly. An increase in numbers no longer increases the per capita production, but on the contrary lessens it. Only better methods of exploitation can now offset the disadvantages of increased population. The old tradition, however, has become so ingrained that the knowledge of the new condition makes but slow progress. Every town and village has its chamber of commerce or "booster club," whose chief object is

to advertise the place and bring more people to it. A few speculators make something out of this and the general public pays the bill without knowing that it does so. Not all of this is either bad or selfish for it has the effect of attracting people away from crowded centers to less densely populated regions. But there are some people to whom the sight of an unspoiled bit of prairie acts as a provocation. Instead of thanking Heaven that there is still an undefiled spot for our children to enjoy, he regards its existence almost as an insult or reflection on his public spirit. He will not rest until he has brought someone from no matter where, to come and occupy it.

We may state the proposition, then, as follows: Other things being equal, a growing population is a good thing as long as it increased *per capita* production. It becomes a bad thing the moment a further increase reduces the *per capita* production. The moment this point is reached good policy demands that immigrants be excluded and the birth rate reduced if necessary to preserve the maximum *per capita* production.

If the world is to get on rationally and harmoniously it must learn to use its environment intelligently, learn not to overcrowd it in such a way as to create a scramble whose chief object is the filling of stomachs on one end of the economic scale and purely destructive consumption on the other, for

both are essentially inimical to the fullest development of the individual, or personality, which we have now come to regard as the principal object of society. This aim can never be achieved under such pressure, and the only way to avoid that pressure is to voluntarily limit the number of stomachs to be filled. Such limitation would automatically destroy both extremes without causing any radical change in the method of exploitation, for, by making labor scarce we place it in position to exact a fuller return for its service. This will give the laborer an opportunity for general culture, for rounding out his personality, and at the same time compel the capitalist to give up the most destructive of his luxuries—his wastes—because he will no longer be able to secure them.

Nor is there anything impractical or chimerical about this. The French people have already fully grasped the truth and acted upon it with excellent results. They have voluntarily restricted their birth rate in order to maintain a certain standard of living. The consequence is that extreme poverty is very rare in France. There are still a few exceptions in the very poorest class where large families may still be found, but on the whole there is little doubt that the French people are the happiest and most prosperous in the world. This is beyond question the reason France has been for years pacific. She wanted back Alsace and Lorraine, and a few

were willing to risk a war for that object. The majority, however, wished to leave that to a plebiscite in the lost provinces. In a book hardly off the press when the storm broke, a French army captain, Henri Andrillon, wrote: "This propaganda (pacifism) is the more dangerous because France is today pacific both by conviction and interest; she is rich, she is not overpopulated, life there is easier than in any other country in the world, she possesses an immense colonial empire, and consequently she does not only not seek a war, but she runs the risk of not preparing herself sufficiently, which may be for other nations less well dowered than herself, a temptation to force war upon her." In this book, *L'Expansion de L'Allemagne*, the whole subject we are here treating so far as it relates to war, is fully and clearly analyzed. The writer shows that the threat of Germany, not only to France, but to the world, lies in her extraordinary birthrate, and also that the Germans were well aware of this. It did not disturb them in the least. They openly boasted of the fact, saying that it justified their aggressive attitude and rendered France a helpless victim whenever Germany should make up her mind to attack her. The French, they said, were a decadent race: Their birthrate was so low because they had destroyed their power of procreation through immorality. Paris had always been the abode of the devil, as was proved by her immoral stage and the

amount of pornographic literature published there. Americans may as well confess that they have held, if they do not still hold, the same idea. There is, of course, not a word of truth in it. There is not a particle of proof that the French people are any more immoral than any other. They have a somewhat different conception of the sex relations than we have but there is much less downright bestiality in France than there is in America or Germany. It is true that the French exhibit less prudery on this subject, that they do, and always have discussed it frankly. That is probably the reason they have been able to act intelligently. They are satisfied with this policy except for the military weakness which must result from it. If other countries followed her example is there any reason to suppose that they would be less pacific than France has been for years? The French are, perhaps the most excitable people in the world. Those who know something of their stormy past were, therefore, not a little surprised to find them exhibiting a larger degree of self-control during and after the war than the stolid English or the patient and practical American. We expected France to have one of her periodical tantrums when it came to square accounts after the conflict. Nothing of the kind happened. On the contrary, while a proletarian revolution turned the greater part of Europe upside down and seriously menaced England for a time, France quietly settled

down to the task of rehabilitation. Her principal industrial provinces were left in ruins by the invader. A staggering national debt leaves her people facing a dismal future of sacrifice and scanty living. But we hear no cry of despair nor discover any evidence of a rancorous and revolutionary class struggle such as seems to menace us today. There is the usual pulling and hauling between capital and labor as a matter of course, but no radical departure from pre-war demands.

We usually accept the ordeal of a long and costly war as a good test of the moral and economic soundness of a nation. According to that test "decadent" France, with her long experience in rational population control, is the soundest nation in the world today. In the absence of positive evidence of a direct connection between these two facts we are left to conjecture. I am not aware that any one has as yet attempted to explain the near-miracle the case of France presents, and can only express the belief that the true explanation is to be found in Captain Andrillon's statement that life in France is comparatively easy, comfortable, on account of the relatively sparse population. Such an assumption accords exactly with the teachings of the economists, specifically, with the law of diminishing returns.

But whether or not my conjecture with regard to France be correct there can hardly be any doubt that, from a rational point of view, the practice of

fitting her numbers to her resources is the correct one. It is the only method which, when universally adopted, offers any chance for either international or economic peace. We hear much today concerning social justice, the things the individual has a right to demand of society, together with the need of individual altruism. But how can society assume responsibility for the welfare of its members when the individual is free to bring into the world an unlimited number of offsprings, and that almost wholly without reference to his fitness for parenthood? Since the resources at the disposal of any society whatsoever are limited and the power of procreation practically unlimited, does not society assume an impossible task when it undertakes to give "every man a living"? Here is where the individual can be altruistic to some purpose. Let him realize that if he rears an excessively large family he robs others of the chance to have any family at all. From the viewpoint of society, a large family indicates selfishness, if nothing worse, and the head of that family should be penalized by special taxation for every child in excess of a fixed number. That is nothing but elementary justice, compensation for the heavy demand made upon the common heritage. An altruistic pair who understand the problem would refuse to blight the lives of others by compelling them to deny the most insistent call Nature makes to them. This is not theory. The condition exists

today in practically every country in Europe. As Professor Marshall says, young people refuse to marry or defer marriage until the old folks have passed on, because no opportunities open which promise a living for a new family.

I do not maintain that rational birth control will necessarily result in either economic or international peace as an uninterrupted condition, for there are other motives beside the economic that sometimes lead to war. And no matter how prosperous people may be they are never satiated or satisfied. But present inequalities would be reduced and no nation would be so crowded as to be forced into aggression through fear of bald starvation. A nation may decide to make war simply to preserve or raise its standard of living, though its people may be far from actual want. The same thing may be said regarding the class strife. A class is certain to make trouble when it is pressed to extremes of misery. It is true that it may sometimes decide on a test of strength precisely because it is for the moment in a strong position economically but fears that at some future time it will be taken when in a disadvantageous position.

There is much truth in the saying that "Necessity is the mother of invention." Nearly all of us require a spur of some kind to start us and keep us going. But we do not do our best work when driven too hard either individually or as a race. Civilization

originated in the protected and fertile valleys of the Nile, the Tigris and Euphrates, and the secluded coasts and islands of the Mediterranean. Men were required in these regions to put forth a reasonable amount of effort to sustain life, but were left with a reserve of strength for the so-called spiritual interests. On the great plains there was no security. Every tribe was continually exposed to the attacks and robbery of its neighbors. There was no encouragement to settle down to systematic exploitation of the soil, so that necessities always remained pressing and every ounce of energy was used merely to escape disaster. On the other hand, life seems to have been too easy in the tropics to call forth men's energies. The torrid zone, outside the high plateaus of Mexico and South America, where tropical conditions do not prevail, has no indigenous civilization to show.

These facts seem to point to the golden mean as the best guide here as in most other things. Struggle, competition, is a necessity, as evolution teaches. But it can be overdone. If the various nations of the earth will adjust their numbers to their resources the economic, or rational causes which now lead them to war will be removed.

It should be understood, however, that this conscious restriction of numbers will not in itself lead to a moral and rational society. It is only the first, the indispensable step which must be taken to clear

the ground and give us the necessary elbow room for our supplementary measures. For, no matter what else we may do as long as there is no check upon procreation among those classes who have no economic reserve we shall always be encumbered with a crowd of misfit, incompetent, and diseased individuals, who will render all our efforts at betterment unavailing. If we can prevent the large wreckage of normal individuals now produced by the severity of the struggle for existence we can gradually trim away the lower strata of misery, crime and disease. We can take systematic measures to prevent the biologically unfit from reproducing their kind. Society is today carrying a heavy burden in the large number of insane, and feeble minded and persons made unfit through inherited defects. It is among these that a large proportion of criminals and the morally weak are found. To forbid these people to marry would not remove the difficulty, for most of them would probably form irregular unions much more harmful socially than marriage. But in permitting marriage society could justly require sterilization of at least one member of each pair. I know that such a law would arouse a storm of protest from theological moralists, but in a rational discussion they would soon be placed so decisively on the defensive that they would either be compelled to subside or stand convicted of hypocrisy. As a matter of fact, the ground has already been cut

from under their feet. For while in the orthodox view marriage is still simply a breeding proposition, every sensible person knows that such a view is narrow and inadequate, that the functions of the sex instinct are much wider than procreation, and that, therefore, the object of marriage also must be wider. All that is really lacking is courage to avow our ideas. The idea for which I am contending is already being acted on in the sterilization of criminals and feeble minded who voluntarily submit to it. Projects for laws making sterilization compulsory have aroused some opposition, but I find that many people have a total misconception of the nature of the sterilizing operation. When it is explained to them they see the matter in a different light.

This is, to my mind, the only road to freedom, to true peace and self-determination. It is a long road, one which we shall travel slowly and haltingly, if at all. Much mental rubbish must be removed before the road is open. It will be blocked in the name of liberty and personal immunity, morality and religion. Our emotions and sympathies will blind us to the true view. It is a hard thing to forbid any human being the gratification of the all but universal love of offspring. But in reality that is not what is involved. There are very few people, I believe, who, if they knew in advance that their offspring is doomed to misery, would not gladly forego the gratification of the parental instinct. No other attitude

can be justified on the basis of love. We have to contend not with love but with selfishness and ignorance. I am building on the assumption that the human race is not altogether hopeless, that when we understand the strategic importance of this matter, the enormous significance it has for the whole human race, we shall muster enough self-control to put through a program of this kind. More light will come to us as we proceed. As the movement gains headway and by its results discloses its fundamental character as the master-key to our social and political problems we shall gain additional assurance. While it is doing its work the value of the individual will re-emerge and make itself evident through increased self-restraint, the result of better training and freedom from those desperate needs which break down the moral resistance of all but Nature's strongest. As he gains strength to walk in the ways of righteousness unaided the need for restrictive laws will gradually disappear and with it will disappear the menace of social tyranny, and the individual, who carries within himself all the real, the ultimate spiritual values, will become truly free.

This is the only road by which the moral and rational man can emerge from the natural or animal man. It is the only way in which evolution can become rational and humane. This will furnish us a test. If we are indeed what we feel we are, endowed with the power of indefinite advance without the

coercion of necessity, we shall prosper in peace unless we needlessly and deliberately choose war and conflict. If we have not this internal motive force then we shall either go back to our present methods or fall by the wayside as numberless other species have done before us.

172.4
K955p

#108/03

Kuhlman

Pacifism as the unifying thesis of all

172.4
K955p

#108/03

Kuhlman

Pacifism as the unifying thesis
of all social reform

DATE	ISSUED TO

THE MASTER'S COLLEGE
POWELL LIBRARY
SANTA CLARITA, CA 91321

THE MASTER'S COLLEGE

172.4 K955p

Kuhlman, Charles/Pacifism as the unifyin

MAIN



3 3540 00009 2250